

AMERICA

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

VOL. XXIV. No. 26 }
WHOLE No. 603 }

April 16, 1921

{ \$4.00 A YEAR
{ PRICE, 10 CENTS

CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHRONICLE	608-611
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
Capital, Labor, Religion, the Negro—What Is Religion Anyhow?—Socialism in France—Free Speech and the Movies	612-619
COMMUNICATIONS	619-620
EDITORIALS	
Our Paternalistic Government—Humiliating the Ambassador—Illiterate Patriots—"One Hundred Cords of Wood" And Charity—A Dreadful Doll	621-623
LITERATURE	
"Dear Prue's" Husband—St. Mary Magdalene—Reviews—Books and Authors—Books Received	623-627
EDUCATION	
Arkansas Roads and Education	628-629
SOCIOLOGY	
On to Centralization	629-630
NOTE AND COMMENT	630-631

Chronicle

Home News.—The note recently sent by Secretary Hughes to the Governments of France, Great Britain, Italy and Japan, was published on April 6. It is concerned with the disposition made of the German overseas possessions and in particular with the mandate granted to Japan over the Island of Yap. Mr. Hughes declares that the United States acquired indisputable rights over the disposition of such possessions by virtue of its share in the common victory, by the fact that it was one of the Powers to which Germany surrendered these possessions, and by the acknowledgment of its right in the very terms of the mandate which was granted to Japan. He notes, however, that this indisputable and acknowledged right of the United States has not been respected in the disposition of such possessions and in particular in the disposal of the Island of Yap. He assumes that this disregard of the rights of the United States has taken place under a misapprehension, and he expresses his confidence that in the light of these facts, the matter will be submitted to reconsideration with a view to securing the just interests of all concerned.

Note to Allied Powers in particular with the mandate granted to Japan over the Island of Yap. Mr. Hughes declares that the United States acquired indisputable rights over the disposition of such possessions by virtue of its share in the common victory, by the fact that it was one of the Powers to which Germany surrendered these possessions, and by the acknowledgment of its right in the very terms of the mandate which was granted to Japan. He notes, however, that this indisputable and acknowledged right of the United States has not been respected in the disposition of such possessions and in particular in the disposal of the Island of Yap. He assumes that this disregard of the rights of the United States has taken place under a misapprehension, and he expresses his confidence that in the light of these facts, the matter will be submitted to reconsideration with a view to securing the just interests of all concerned.

Mr. Hughes is of opinion that there is no disposition on the part of any of the Powers to question the fact that

the United States shared in the victory over Germany, or to cast doubt on the consequent right it acquired to have a voice in the disposal of former German possessions. He cites Article 119 of the Versailles Treaty, which reads as follows: "Germany renounces in favor of the principal Allied and Associated Powers all her rights and titles over her overseas possessions." He also quotes from the draft convention of the mandate granted to Japan to show that the effectiveness of any disposal of the German possessions necessarily calls for the participation of the United States: "The principal Allied and Associated Powers agreed that, in accordance with Article XXII, Part I (Covenant of the League of Nations), a mandate should be conferred on His Majesty the Emperor of Japan to administer the said islands. . . ."

Having established the right of the United States, Mr. Hughes proceeds to show that this Government has never lost that right, and that no valid disposition of the German possessions can take place without the consent of the United States. The United States, he says, has never vested the Supreme Council or the League of Nations with any authority to bind the United States or to act in its name, nor could it be considered to have ceded its right either to Japan or to any other nations except by treaty. No such cession by treaty has taken place. Neither can the United States be regarded as being bound by the Treaty of Versailles, because it has not ratified that treaty, although in point of fact, so far from implying any surrender of American rights, the treaty rather confirms those rights. Furthermore, the very terms of the mandate to Japan convey the impression that the United States has not only retained its right to participate in the disposition of the German possessions, but has actually exercised it by giving consent. Mr. Hughes notes that the impression that consent was given, although erroneous, is a clear implication of the recognition of American right. He, therefore, declares:

As the United States did not enter this convention or into any treaty relating to the subject, this Government is unable to understand upon what grounds it was thereafter attempted to confer the mandate without the agreement of the United States. It is manifest that the League of Nations was without any authority to bind the United States, and the confirmation of the mandate in question and the definition of its terms by the Council of the League of Nations in December, 1920, cannot be regarded as having efficacy with respect to the United States.

Consequently the action of the Supreme Council and of the League in assigning to Japan a mandate over the Island of Yap and in fixing the terms of that mandate is, according to Mr. Hughes without finality, for the rea-

son that the assent of the United States was not given to such arrangements.

With regard to the contention that the United States may be held to have ceded its right by its failure to make immediate protest against the action of the Supreme Council of May 7, 1919, Mr. Lansing holds that such protest was unnecessary, because the United States had repeatedly refused to sanction the arrangement, as is clear from the reservations made by former President Wilson in the meetings of the Supreme Council on April 21, April 30 and May 1, 1919. The attitude of the United States is shown by a statement made to the Department of State, on March 3, 1921, by Mr. Wilson, which is in part as follows:

My first information of a contention that the so-called decision of May 7, 1919, by the council of four assigned to Japan a mandate for the island of Yap was conveyed to me by Mr. Norman Davis in October last. I then informed him that I had never consented to the assignment of the island of Yap to Japan.

I had not previously given particular attention to the wording of the Council's minutes of May 7, 1919, which were only recently called to my attention. I had on several occasions prior to the date mentioned made specific reservations regarding the Island of Yap, and had taken the position that it should not be assigned under mandate to any one power, but should be internationalized for cable purposes. I assumed that this position would be duly considered in connection with the settlement of the cable question and that it therefore was no longer a matter for consideration in connection with the peace negotiations. I never abandoned nor modified this position in respect to the Island of Yap, and I did not agree on May 7, 1919, or at any other time, that the Island of Yap should be included in the assignment of mandates to Japan.

As a matter of fact, all agreements arrived at regarding the assignment of mandates were conditional upon a subsequent agreement being reached as to the specific terms of the mandates, and, further, upon their acceptance by each of the principal allied and associated powers. The consent of the United States is essential both as to assignments of mandates and the terms and provisions of the mandates, after agreement as to their assignment or allocation.

The consent of the United States, as you know, has never been given on either point as to the Island of Yap.

Mr. Wilson's action, according to the Secretary of State, rendered any protest unnecessary, even in the erroneous supposition that the Supreme Council's action could have finality without the explicit assent of the United States. Nevertheless the United States did actually make formal protests against the action of the Supreme Council by notes sent to Japan and other Governments on November 9, 1920, and by subsequent communications. He declares, therefore, that, as no one has ever been authorized to cede or surrender the right or interest of the United States in the Island of Yap:

This Government must insist that it has not lost its right or interest as it existed prior to any action of the Supreme Council or of the League of Nations, and cannot recognize the allocation of the island or the validity of the mandate to Japan.

Mr. Hughes has the greatest confidence that the matter will be readjusted to the satisfaction of all concerned, because the United States seeks no exclusive rights in the Island of Yap nor any privilege not accorded to others.

France.—The resumption of diplomatic relations between France and the Holy See has been held up by the Senate, which decided to postpone the consideration of

the bill until the budget had been disposed of. In all probability this means a delay until autumn. Premier Briand

*The Senate and the
Vatican Embassy*

appeared in person before the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Senate to urge an early consideration of the embassy bill. He pointed out that France is greatly hampered, in comparison with other countries, by not having an official ambassador at the Vatican. The misfortune, he said, was that this question, which should be dealt with apart from all controversy, should not be settled at once. It ought not, he added, to be allowed to fall into the domain of party politics. A rapid solution, he concluded, was therefore highly desirable. Coming from the formerly violently anti-clerical Aristide Briand, these words were significant, but had for the moment at least but little influence on the senatorial commission.

Although the lower Chamber has a considerable number of members, either Catholics in faith and ideas, or at least unbiased towards the Church, and favorable to the resumption of diplomatic relations with the Vatican, the Senate still musters a large number of extreme Radicals, who in their declining years are living over again the bitter anti-clerical controversies of former days, controversies well-nigh forgotten by the rest of France, and not conducive to that *union sacrée* which held together Frenchmen of every shade of politics during the war. Gustave Hervé, who in the past did all in his power to undermine the salutary influence of the Catholic Church in France, has no sympathy with this unprogressive and reactionary body. Writing in the *Victoire*, he says that there is in the Upper Chamber an influential group of Radical Socialists whose only policy is hatred of the priest. This, he continues, has been their only program for thirty, forty, fifty years; it has become a part of their very being, and they cannot live without it. The *Paris Temps*, quoted by *La Croix*, recalls the fact that the bill for the resumption of diplomatic relations with the pontifical court passed the Chamber November 30, 1920, by the decisive vote of 391 to 179. It "wonders" at the delays which marked every stage of the progress of the bill before the Senate. The latter has the power to postpone the operation of the measure. But the Government has pledged itself to resume diplomatic relations with the Holy Father, and the measure has the support of the country at large, with the exception of a dangerous faction, which would imperil the country's highest interests rather than "make peace" with Rome.

Germany.—The question considered to be of supreme importance throughout Germany today is that concerning the accountability for the war. The entire Peace Treaty is understood to be built upon article 231, in which Germany confesses herself guilty. This confession, it is argued, was extracted by force. Hence the Government

*Accountability for
the War*

undertook, more than a year ago, a thorough investigation and compilation of all the acts of the Foreign Office bearing upon the causes of the World War. This has now been completed and the first volumes, covering the period from 1873 to 1901, are passing through the press. The complete work will comprise about fifteen volumes and is expected to appear before the end of the year. Everything, it is promised, will be laid before the public so that an impartial judgment can be formed. The committee delegated to deal with the period immediately preceding the war announces that it has carefully investigated all the available documents of the various nations relative to the mobilization and authorizes the following conspectus of "facts and data" to be published as "proved" by evidence:

I.—INTRODUCTORY: (1) The partial mobilization of Austria against Serbia which took place July 25, at 9.30 P.M., comprised eight army corps with twenty-two divisions. The territory of none of these eight army corps touched upon the Russian boundaries. Serbia had announced its mobilization on the same day, at 3 P.M. (2) According to the documents of the Vienna Ministry of War no further mobilization was ordered from the evening of July 25 until noon of July 31. The orders of the day of the Russian General Staff confirm that no knowledge of any general mobilization in Austria-Hungary existed there. (3) The officially admitted partial Russian mobilization of July 29 extended over a section containing 86,000,000 inhabitants. It comprised fifty-five infantry and eight and a half cavalry divisions, besides various bodies of cossack troops. Sailors, too, in the most northern *gouvernements* were included. (4) The mobilization of the English fleet was extraordinarily facilitated by the fact that the three home fleets, with 460 pennants, were gathered at Portland since July 16 for a trial mobilization and maneuvers, and on July 26 the intended demobilization was given over.

II.—CHRONOLOGICAL SUCCESSION OF WAR ORDERS IN THE LAST STAGE PRECEDING THE GENERAL MOBILIZATION: (1) Russia—Official enforcement of the "period of war preparation" for the entire European Russia, July 26. (2) England—Warning telegram for army and navy, July 29. (3) France—Order to draw up the frontier guards, July 30. (4) Austria-Hungary—Alarm sounded against Russia, July 31. (5) Germany—Condition of threatening danger of war, July 31.

III.—CHRONOLOGICAL SUCCESSION OF GENERAL MOBILIZATION OF THE POWERS: (1) Russia—Secret orders probably given in the course of the evening, July 29. Official order issued July 30, 6 P.M. (2) Austria-Hungary—July 31, at 12.23 P.M. (3) France—August 1, at 4.40 P.M. (4) Germany—August 1, at 5 P.M. (5) England—the fleet: August 2, at 2.25 A.M. the army (expeditionary force): August 3, at twelve o'clock noon time.

The committee, we are told, has ascertained that no secret orders of mobilization were given in Germany or Austria-Hungary. The question whether Russia had issued secret orders of mobilization is still to be further investigated. All the above statements are claimed by the committee to be certain from the evidence of the Central-European, Russian, French and English official documents, so that the mobilization for the war is said to have begun with the Russian mobilization, which was answered by a mobilization of Austria-Hungary against

Russia, with France, Germany and England following in the order here indicated. "With her strong sense of honor and of justice," says the *Allgemeine Rundschau*, "America will be one of the first countries to extend her hand to us, once the specter of falsehood regarding the German accountability for the war is dissipated." The official publication will contain more than 4,000 documents. Aside from the necessary brief comments, we are told, they are "to speak for themselves."

Great Britain.—The coal strike, which began in the first days of April, has involved the country in serious economic losses. Great damage has resulted especially in the Welsh mines, from the

The Coal Strike breakdown of the pumping system, as many of the pumpmen, in spite of urgent requests, went out with the strikers early in the week. A royal proclamation calling in a special manner former service men under arms, was posted in London April 9 and informed the crowds that read it of the gravity of the situation. In the Commons the Premier declared that the mines must be protected at all costs, and that emergency troops, as indicated in the King's proclamation, must be speedily enrolled to help the regular police force. In a letter of regret over the strike situation, addressed to Mr. Frank Hodges, Secretary of the Miners' Union, Mr. Lloyd George said that the destruction of the mines would be as fatal to the nation, as would have been defeat in the war, and to secure their preservation must be the Government's first duty.

On Saturday, April 9, it was known that negotiations for a settlement of the dispute had collapsed. A million railwaymen and transport workers were immediately ordered to quit work at midnight April 12 in sympathy with the miners. London dailies declared that the kingdom faced the most serious crisis since the days of 1914, with labor's most powerful elements arrayed against threatened reductions in wages. The reserves were called out, a call for volunteers was issued and the Government planned to fight what it called "direct action" with every agency in its power. Officials of the Triple Alliance, the miners, transport workers and railwaymen, declared that the general strike set for April 12, would take effect without further warning, unless negotiations between the miners and the Government were reopened. The miners stood firm in their demand for a continuation of government control of the pits, government subsidies and national control of profits and against the lowered scale of wages which the owners hope to put into effect. The railwaymen and transport workers, believing that the reduction of the miners' wages is a step towards reduction in other industries, joined the miners in an effort to stop the downward movement. But a rift in the darkening cloud came on the night of April 10, when the striking miners and the owners agreed to get together and seek means to put an end to the situation.

Mr. Lloyd George, it was then stated, would call the conference of the men and the owners for the morning of April 11. Both sides enter the conference without binding themselves to any conditions.

Ireland.—The report of the American Commission on Conditions in Ireland, to be had from L. Hollingsworth Wood, 501 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N. Y., is

Report of American Commission

already stirring the conscience of the Christian world to a remarkable degree. During the week Sir Hamar Greenwood was interpolated by T. P. O'Connor on the subject, but the tyrannical Canadian avoided the issue by declaring the Government did not intend to notice the document. This may be apropos for the present, but since 50,000 copies of the document are issuing from British presses, no doubt the Government will take notice of the matter later. Last week the British Ambassador to the United States declared the report *ex parte*. Though from the beginning he refused to testify before the non-partisan, non-political Commission, he was again invited to appear before it. In answer to this second invitation, the following note was sent from the embassy, to the chairman of the Commission:

I am directed by his Britannic Majesty's ambassador to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 1st instant in regard to the report of the self-constituted, unofficial body styling itself the American Commission on Conditions in Ireland, and to the communique which was issued to the press by this embassy.

I am directed to draw attention to the letter from this embassy addressed to Mr. William MacDonald on October 23, 1920, in which it was definitely stated that the British Government would do nothing to encourage the holding of this inquiry or to assist witnesses to appear before the commission. This decision remains unmodified.

The Ambassador, therefore, not only refuses to testify, but exerts all this authority, unsuccessfully, however, to prevent the truth from appearing and now appears to think that two words, self-constituted and unofficial, discredit the unimpeachable evidence of British atrocities.

Conditions have changed very little during the week. Blood is flowing as freely as ever, and there seems small hope of amicable relations between the two nations.

Murder and Propaganda

British propaganda goes merrily on in the same, old perverse fashion. The following item, taken from the New York *World* under date of April 5, will show how little credence can be placed in British reports:

London, April 4.—The latest and crudest weapons with which the Crown Government in Ireland is attempting to fight the Sinn Fein are fake Sinn Fein bulletins which are being sent not only to British newspapers but to American and other foreign correspondents also. Until exposed in Parliament, similar tactics were used against Soviet Russia. Faked editions of the Russian newspaper *Pravda* were made available to all foreign correspondents at Helsingfors, but the news was concocted in London and the paper itself printed here.

Several copies of the faked Irish bulletin have been sent to the *World's* London bureau. One of these purported to show that the Sinn Fein had formed a commission which would have

direct charge of peace negotiations and which the bulletin said, had been appointed at the recent meeting of the Dail Eireann, and that body, the bulletin said, also thanked Herbert S. Asquith, Commander Kenworth, Joseph Devlin and Brigadier General Cockerill "for their great efforts in the interest of peace between this nation and the English Government."

This clumsy scheme was exposed to-day in both the *Manchester Guardian* and the *Daily Herald*. It will serve only to accentuate the unreliability of the stream of propaganda loosed daily at Dublin Castle and the Irish office in London, of which one glaring example recently was the announcement from Dublin Castle of the discovery of a big bomb cache where artillery shells also were found.

It was made out then that this artillery ammunition had been landed on the Irish coast. This statement, it is said, was resented by the navy, which is jealous of the efficiency of its patrol of the Irish coast.

The supposed artillery ammunition turned out to be only a few empty shell cases. Sir Hamar Greenwood recently asked Parliament for more money for propaganda.

This is on a par with the stories about Irish priests that are being passed from mouth to mouth in the United States. An example of the latter stories is that Sinn Fein pays Irish priests \$100 for every Unionist whose death the priest encompasses.

Italy.—The promulgation on April 6 of a royal decree dissolving the Chamber and fixing the general election for May 15 caused something of a sensation in Parliament.

Parliament Dissolved

For some weeks past a general election has been regarded as imminent. But many Deputies hoped that the King would at the last moment be reluctant to add to the unsettled and troubled condition of the country by calling the electors to the polls with the Legislature less than a year and a half in existence. Prudent observers, however, maintained that, in spite of some possible trouble and clashes between the Fascisti and Communists, the appeal to the country was not so inopportune as at first sight it might appear, and that its results may tend to clear up the political atmosphere. Whatever be the case, Premier Giolitti succeeded in convincing the King that the Chamber as constituted, not only did not represent the will of the people, but could not secure a safe majority to the Cabinet.

The party which dreads the election most is the Socialist, as it realizes that the reaction of the middle classes has been so thorough, that in all likelihood, not half the present number of Socialist deputies will be sent back to Parliament. Their discomfiture, in fact, was so great that they threatened to abstain altogether from presenting themselves as candidates at the polls, in order to be able to declare that the coming Parliament would be unconstitutional without representatives of the Socialist party. But they reconsidered their first decision and will present candidates in certain localities where the chances seem favorable to their election. The Constitutional group, on the contrary, welcomes the elections as they hope largely to increase their numbers. The re-opening of Parliament is set for June 8.

Capital, Labor, Religion, the Negro

WILLIAM H. MARKOE

CAPITAL and labor, big business corporations and militant labor unions, the open and the closed-shop, make the questions of the hour. Of what importance is the Negro in the war between wage-earner and employer? What place does he occupy in the intensely interesting industrial strife, fraught with fearful consequences, being waged before our eyes? Is the Negro a problem in himself only? Certainly he is a problem; but he is something more. He is a decided factor which must be reckoned with in the broader question of capital and labor.

The problem which he is in himself has a clear-cut solution akin to that which the Catholic Church offers for the labor trouble. In her program for economic or social reform, the Church does not merely condemn Socialism, Bolshevism, and other radical and false curatives; she also points out the evils of an unrestrained tyrannical system of capitalism. The former are robbers at heart, greedily seeking the booty with envious eyes. The latter is the "thief in the saddle." Properly to adjust the strained relations between capital and labor, the Church asks, as the first step, that both meet on the common ground of justice, which must be the basic principle of a real treaty of peace between these two great economic forces. The employer must understand that the workman is not a slave, pay a just wage, and consent to reasonable hours of service. The employe has correlative duties of industry, application, and loyalty. So it is with the race question. The white man must meet the black man. Both must stand on a platform of justice and each must give to his fellow a fair deal. Catholic principles of sociology alone can successfully arbitrate between capital and labor. Justice is the only solution of the race problem.

That this remedy be applied is of the highest importance, not only because of the menace intrinsic to the race question itself, but because the latter is an integral part of our labor problem. The way in which the Negro's own question is solved will largely determine the outcome of the conflict between capital and labor in as far as the Negro is a part of that conflict. Give the Negro what is due him in justice as a man and a citizen, and the millions of black workers will have a wholesome influence on the industrial situation. Let the white man refuse to meet him half-way and the Negro may be goaded to wield a fatal balance of power in the strife.

The colored worker occupies a strategic position in the labor world. About one of every nine citizens is a Negro; one of every seven workers a black man. The position of the colored worker is unique. Practically speaking he does not and cannot form a part of American organized labor because of discrimination. He is not

a union man. The unions are organized along the lines of the various trades and industries, and are more or less loosely united through the American Federation of Labor. The colored worker's "brotherhoods" are loosely differentiated by the trades and industries, but strongly welded together by the common bond of race. In this lies their strength. The colored people of America, politically, financially, and industrially, are daily becoming more and more a nation within a nation, a distinct people united by bands of steel wrought by the white man's unyielding prejudice and injustice.

How may the colored group as a whole seriously affect the industrial situation? Let us see. There are within that group millions of Negro workers, comprising probably one-seventh of all American labor. This black force is a racial unit by itself, with common grievances and aspirations, rapidly approaching perfection as an organization. It may prove a powerful ally of radical Socialism. It may be induced to join hands with organized labor. It may find it more advantageous to serve the money lords as potent auxiliaries against the unions. Or finally, despised, except for utilitarian motives, by every element of white society, it may deem it wiser to stand apart and play its own game. Whatever it does, it is fairly certain that it will act as a unit; it will carry with it sufficient power and strength to produce serious consequences for good or for evil. If ill-treatment on the part of conservatives and the blandishments of radicals induce the Negro to make common cause with revolutionary forces, he may be the asset necessary to overwhelm the existing order. If the unions grow wise and, in practice as well as in theory, really admit the blacks to their ranks, American labor may yet be strong enough to force capitalism to bend the knee. Used against organized labor, the colored race, acting as one man, may in the future be a mighty force to snatch the palm of victory from the unions which were too good to receive him. Standing aloof, distrusting all, the Negro will continue a suspicious, discontented element in the Republic. One thing is certain: in the future the blacks must be taken into account. They can no longer be reckoned with as a powerless rabble. The way in which they will use their strength will depend upon how the white man meets the colored man's own problem, on how he adjusts the latter's own grievances.

The Negro, for the most part, belongs to the laboring class, but, more than that, he is colored. To him, grievances due to color stand before those which are common to him as a laborer. His own problem, considered as a disease, is to him more grievous than the labor question in general. The white workman has his economic rights trampled on; the black is denied justice not only in the

economic world, but rights more important and fundamental are despised, his civil rights are ignored, and, worst of all, he is not always accorded justice in matters of religion. First, even as a worker, the state of the Negro is infinitely worse than that of the white laborer. The latter has fought for and obtained much that is due him; but, while struggling to better his own condition, he has not scrupled to ostracize and walk over his fellow-worker, the defenseless, non-union, black toiler. Accordingly, the Negro has not only to fight against the tyranny of capitalism, but he also has to contend with "white" organized labor. But this is the least of the colored man's sorrows. Unlike any class of white society, the Negro, secondly, often has no guarantee for his personal safety and is subject to a unique exploitation in regard to the necessities of life. Since the Civil War, at the rate of almost two victims a week, he has had to pay the "supreme sacrifice" at the hands of the mob. Probably not more than about one-third of these victims were even accused, not to say convicted, of assaults upon white women. The charge of rape is frequently a blind for the passion of cruelty. In his daily trading at stores where he must buy food and clothing, in his efforts to occupy a decent home and to obtain domestic comforts, the Negro is fleeced as no other class of people is fleeced. This abuse is building up great independent Negro interests in business and real estate. Prosperity for the colored merchant, banker, and real-estate man has already begun. Thirdly, millions of Negroes, though they are citizens, do not share the rights of citizenship. They are made to fight for the Republic, but do not fully enjoy its benefits. They cannot vote. They are taxed for schools, but themselves are granted little education. They pay a municipal tax without the full advantage of neighborhood improvements or police protection.

Finally, the bitterest of all afflictions is suffered by this outcast people when they complain that their very souls are allowed to starve spiritually and that prejudice bars them from the treasure houses of God's Kingdom. This last lamentation is the saddest of all, because it touches not only that which is of this world, but even the immortal soul. All these grievances, and many more, are making the colored people a rapidly growing power and a menace; their grievances make the platform upon which the race stands united; for the Negro, they form his own problem; a problem which is far more important to him than that of labor in general. Its treatment will determine his attitude on wider questions.

If we wish him to be strong, healthy, and not rotten fiber, in the fabric of this Republic, we must face his own problem. If we wish him to have a wholesome influence on the grave issues which exist today between capital and labor, we must begin by treating him as a man, a fellow-citizen, and a Christian. In this important matter American Catholics must lead the way. If they do not, who will? Our 20,000,000 Catholics must each, as far as it is in his power, set an example in granting civil

and economic justice to the Negro. If we do this we shall be an irresistible force for the betterment of our race problem and so forestall gathering industrial and revolutionary storms. We shall not, however, grant the colored man justice in profane matters, until we first learn to accord him his just dues in that which is far more important and sacred, religion. Our first duty, therefore, towards the Negro is to exert ourselves to the utmost for his conversion, and to do all in our power for his moral uplift and Catholic education.

What Is Religion Anyhow?

MARK SHRIVER, JR.

NOWADAYS much time is wasted in discussions as to whether the Church has labored in vain and Christianity is a failure. Most of the discussions are based on an utter misconception of Christianity, and a peculiar misapprehension of the functions and purposes of a Church. As the Y. M. C. A. constitutionally excludes from full membership in its fold members of the oldest body of Christians, the vacuity of discussion by its leaders is apparent. Discussion by ministers has little more weight. For all of them the first false step comes with their misunderstanding of the purpose of a Church, from an inexactness in defining religion. A process of exclusion is, perhaps, as good a way as any of finding out what religion is, and what it is not.

First and principally religion is not intermeddling in the affairs of national, State or local government. It is not that form of bigotry and intolerance styling itself temperance. As a word temperance implies moderation and graciousness and tact and wisdom and justice. As a thing it is the desired of the Eternal Hills. "*In medio*," said Horace, "*stat virtus*," but it is as far from the intemperance and rancor of the radical Prohibitionists to the real thing as from Hades to Connaught.

From the creation of the world, the human race has made and used alcoholic stimulants. The Bible itself records the celebration our Father Noah held when the Ark had finally run aground on the tipmost peak of Arrarat. It is common sense that a habit spirituously persisted in by all men at all times from the dawn of history, cannot of itself be wrong. Until the advent of these sanctimonious reformers neither Christian or Jew had condemned the habit. Here appears a peculiar fault characteristic of those who roll the failure of the Church in limpid phrase across their parched and burning lips. Here too they seem unable to distinguish between a thing as it is and its use or abuse. Here their zeal outweighs their judgment and like another judgment o'erleaps itself, and falls on the other side.

Religion is not the closing of dance halls, nor the suppression of racing, nor the encouragement of anti-gambling crusades. If gambling is essentially and inherently evil, it should be stopped absolutely. Of course all business is a gamble, and all dealing in trade of every kind. The reformers may carry life or accident insurance, they

may even have concealed somewhere about the house that form of policy issued by Mr. Lloyd of London which insures against the dire mishap of twins. Treasurers of their societies may be bonded for greater security against loss, but if it be lawful for reformers to wager \$100 with the surety company, against, let us say, \$10,000 that the treasurers will not steal \$10,000 in the course of the year, modestly, but none the less earnestly, I claim the right to hazard two bits on the chance that the galloping dominoes will not disclose the fatal deuce-ace on the first roll of the bones, or that the choice of the little ball will be the pocket fringed with black. It all depends on algebra, or, as an old teacher of mine would say simple arithmetic.

Religion is not the stopping of Sunday base-ball, or golf, or tennis. It is not an unreasoning, unending cry for the sanctity of the Sabbath. The Sabbath passed with the Jewish dispensation. Sunday, the day we recognize is the antithesis of the Sabbath as held by the Jews of the Old Testament. There is a Commandment which says the Sabbath should be kept holy, but not even Dr. Bowlby wants to stop the mails of a Saturday and if he would stop them on a Sunday he must look elsewhere for an argument or a justification. This authority is and can only be the Catholic Church, for from the beginning of the Christian era to 1524 there was but one Church, and no Protestants at all. During those years something must have been done sometime about this matter of Sabbath observance. Either that or all the world was in dreadful sin, and doomed to lie in Tophet. Dr. Bowlby can sit on whichever horn he chooses. But the Reverend Doctor may not believe in hell or an infinite justice any more than in some other wholesome truths. Keep holy the Sunday, is the teaching of the Catholic Church, and Catholics keep it holy by rendering to God the things that are God's. After that Caesar gets his proportion. Every Catholic goes to Mass on Sundays and having made his acknowledgment to his Creator he spends the rest of the day in recreation. And God wishes him to have this recreation. If a recreation is harmless *per se* how can it become an evil or an agency for evil simply because it is indulged in on Sunday? Such an argument does not condone doing unnecessary servile work, but in these days many things are necessary which were not so in the past. The messengers of Father Abraham could walk, or carry their letters on a camel's back but New York mail for California must travel by rail, or plane. And this does not deny one day of rest in seven. The argument is for Sunday amusement for those who toil the other six days and can find no other time for recreation.

Religion is not a chronic and continued ache that urges unceasing attack on the pleasures of life. One of the very purposes of religion is to put them back, in heaping and abounding measure. And a religious service is not the herding together of the faithful to hear described in lickerish phrases the nakedness of Aphrodite,

the moisture of a New York cabaret or the nudity of a metropolitan statue. Small wonder folk with one-way minds believe the world gone plumb to perdition, while their deluded dupes fall to thinking of a real church and a real religion as the peak and pinnacle of Puritanism, and leaving their empty buildings go out to the open places and breathe the pure air and bask in the glorious sunshine of a bright and beautiful world. Small wonder the normal man listening to the vaporings of master psalm-singers realizes that normal people cannot live on such a plan, and declares that if that be the Church, then is the Church not for him. Small wonder he goes his way with a beclouded mind and a misunderstanding heart leaving things that should be closest to him for others.

Puritanism has made the non-Catholic Churches a failure, and the emptiness of their pews testifies more loudly to this than could the cryings of a backward-looker for 1,000 years. And Puritanism is hypocrisy.

When a Methodist minister selects the ten most sensational titles his ingenuity can suggest and notifies the press that those will be his topics for ten Sundays; when a Baptist rises in a pulpit that should be holy and declares with fulsome detail that he can throw a stone from where he stands to a house of ill fame; when a Protestant Episcopal minister shouts from his pulpit that the police are corrupt, and repeats with gusto a tale some unnamed youth has recited to him, and then being called to account by the grand jury hastily recants and declares he referred to the police of Kalamazoo or Keokuk; when a minister of some unnamed sect proclaims his belief in the uselessness of theological schools and the teaching of theology, declaring that there should be one grand and all-embracing school, teaching nothing in particular, graduated and arranged for all divergence and dissonance, including, as you prefer, the affirmation or negation of the Divinity of Christ and many conflicting beliefs concerning what our separated brethren call the Lord's Supper; when a distinguished Baptist gentleman narrates with luscious undulation the sensations which he says must rise in men and women as they dance; when he goes down into the gutter for his similes and half concealing, fairly discloses his sensuous thought and so rouses to keener edge the passions he pretends to allay; when in a word the shepherd passes over things Divine and goes out into the highways and hedges to compel men to come in he is frequently successful beyond his fondest hopes, but most who go to those churches go for the delightful sensation of acquiring new knowledge as to how and where the law can be broken in some new and hitherto untried way or place. And that is not religion either. From some standpoints, however, the collection plates carefully dished so that nothing may slip, and that all may see what reposes on top, skilfully passed by one-armed deacons and elders cover a multitude of—well, peccadilloes.

Among other things religion is a wholesome horror

and fear of the divorce evil; a respect for marriage as a Sacrament rather than a convenient civil arrangement to permit the free gratification of desire; or the debasement of it by such a practise as race-suicide, a horrid habit, strangely euphemized of late, the habit fathered by Malthus who must now share his poor glory with Mrs. Sanger and the Chicago factory girl convicted of traitorous utterances during the war. Religion includes a wholesome respect for those Commandments that Catholics know as the Sixth and the Ninth which deal with what some call statutory offenses.

Religion includes the right of private property and the duties and responsibilities that go with it. It is the acknowledgment of an inferior to a Superior, of a creature to a Creator. To have real religion there must be order, and order means the recognition of authority and the respect for it when recognized. Religion must be constructive. It must have an object and an end, and where there is neither there is no religion. There are some pulpit lecturers who debate forward and backward, fighting windmills as ludicrously as ever Don Quixote battled in his wanderings in Spain.

As for Protestantism, it is as its name implies, a protest, a negative. And a negative is nothing. Its very basis is the right of private judgment and the right of any one member to protest against the individual or

collective judgment or opinion or belief of his fellows. A first principle of religion is respect for authority and the first principle of Protestantism denying authority has long since accomplished the ruin of itself, and as it struggles in a death agony, Samson-like, it pulls down the ruin of the structure to crush its followers.

How in Heaven's name can there be aught but failure where there is no hand to set the course or guide the helm; where the one thing held in common is the right to differ; where there is and can be no point of unity, but chance agreement; no one to say what may or must, or can or cannot be believed? A church, the dictionary says, is a distinct body of believers, but if there are no lines to mark it off and make it distinct it cannot be a church. It cannot be anything, for what is, is. Why debate then whether the Church has failed in a mission when by the very basis of the Church there is none to say just what that mission is? As a rudderless ship abandoned by its crew to rats and tempest, it drifts at the mercy of every passing current. With no teacher, no creed, no Gospel save such as the preacher for the time-being may choose to utter, what could be expected but what has come? On what can such a body rest but charlatanry, with which real people have no patience? A church that grows must have something on which to stand.

Socialism in France

A. J. MUENCH

THE pen is mightier than the sword. So said Cardinal Richelieu, the French statesman. His countrymen, the members of the *Confédération Générale du Travail*, the French labor organization, had reason to think of this when by a simple stroke of the pen signing the court decree of Paris, ordering the dissolution of the Federation, their fight for existence through many decades came to a sudden end.

Since the days of the French Revolution labor in France had a stormy career. The guilds were swept out of existence on the memorable night of August 4, 1789, in the name of freedom of labor, a doctrine which even to this day is the cause of serious troubles in other parts of the world besides France. The doom of labor organizations was effectively sealed by the Le Chapelier law, so called from its author, which was passed in March, 1791, by the National Assembly, forbidding associations of masters or of workers in their respective trades. Individualism was at its height. Its unnaturalness soon showed itself. Isolation was a futile policy. Instead of bringing freedom it brought slavery, imposed on the large, atomized mass of weak people by the few, dominating, strong people. Business interests found themselves hampered; and here, there and everywhere in France, combinations of masters were formed contrary

to the letter and the spirit of the law, but not without the connivance of the police. An edict of toleration permitting these associations under certain restrictions was issued in 1868.

In the meanwhile labor did not fare so well. It was made to feel that the Le Chapelier law was not in statute books accumulating dust on high shelves. From 1825 to 1848 the courts busied themselves with 1,251 cases of "conspiracies of workmen," meting out prison sentences to 4,460 of 7,148 accused offenders against the law. The Second Republic and the Empire brought no relief. From 1848-1868 the courts were occupied with 1,144 cases leading to 4,845 convictions of 6,812 accused before the bench. Unions, however, continued to be formed in spite of the severities of the law. A few concessions were made respecting the formation of mutual-aid societies among workmen.

Labor entered a new phase of existence when in 1884 the famous *loi des syndicats* permitting the formation of *syndicats des ouvriers*, unions of workmen, was passed. The immediate result was the organization of a national federation of the societies that had been established contrary to the law. This first national federation, however, soon came under the control of Jules Guesde, a disciple of Marx, and disappeared from view. There arose a

second federation called *Fédération des Bourses du Travail*, founded at the Congress of Sainte Etienne in 1892. These *bourses* were originally local unemployment bureaus, gradually developing into centers of propaganda which agitated for a cause more radical than that espoused by the Socialists under Guesde. It was a battle of syndicalism against Socialism. Only the local *bourses* of a city were federated, there was no national organization in which single bourses or local federated *bourses* were affiliated. This was a weakness because the *Fédération* had accepted as its policy direct action and had taken as its weapon the general strike. General strikes could be a success only if nationally organized.

The more radical members realized this and succeeded in founding a confederation of local federations at the Congress of Limoges in 1895, which was called *Confédération Générale du Travail*, or the C. G. T., as it was commonly known in France. It made but little progress the first few years. It was not until 1900 when the *La Voix du Peuple* was made its organ of propaganda that success was assured. The *Fédération des Bourses du Travail* gradually lost more and more of its influence over its members with the result that its organization was taken over by the C. G. T. at the Congress of Montpellier in 1902.

The latter organization had a mixture of theories taken partly from Socialism and partly from anarchism. Its uncompromising attitude toward capitalism and the doctrine of the warfare of classes it borrowed from Marx, and from anarchism it learned opposition to the State, to parliamentary action, to political parties including Socialist parties, to ideas of patriotism and duty of military service. Direct action is its policy, sabotage and the general strike its weapons, and the social revolution its aim. On this it based its hope awaiting *le grand soir*, the great night, after which maltreated mankind will look upon a new and righteous world. State and industry will be in the hands of the *syndicats des ouvriers*. Syndicalism will be the name of the new regime, sovietism the newer phraseology calls it.

Because of the revolutionary ideals of the C. G. T. it has caused endless trouble to the French Government, the anti-war attitude of a large part of its members, and its organized expression in 1916 and 1917, put French victory in jeopardy. Those in power had reason to remember this, and meanwhile were grinding their ax. Months sped by and suddenly one swift blow of this governmental ax felled a growth which in the terms of the indictment was a menace to the State. It was charged that the C. G. T. had incited to acts of violence against the French Government; that by its program of action it had put itself outside the pale of law; that the State proceeding from an expression of the national will can no longer tolerate the existence of a minority government of agitators who insist on imposing their will on the nation; and that the organization in striving to build up a State within a State has ceased to operate

for the general welfare of the French Republic. Having lost its reason for existence, it could no longer be allowed standing before the law. The governmental liquidation of its properties was ordered and the accused leaders Jouhaux, Laurent, Lapierre, Dumoulin, and Calvavrach condemned to the payment of a fine.

An appeal was at once entered against this judgment, and a manifesto issued by the C. G. T. to the effect that French workers will not be remiss in defending their rights against an act of violence by a reactionary government of the French Republic, which has dared do what the most reactionary monarchies would have hesitated to do. Having seen the danger they will know how to face it. It is, however, difficult to see how the 4,500 *syndicats* or unions which had been affiliated to the C. G. T. will continue to exist as effective organs of action without a central bureau.

The danger is that the members will flock to the standards of Frossard, Cachin and Renoult, enthusiasts of the Communist regime in Russia. This is so much more likely since these men, as the leaders of the Communist party of France, gained a signal victory over the other Socialist factions at the Congress of Socialists at Tours. Neither the wily influence of Longuet, grandson of Marx and leader of the Reconstructionists, nor the brilliant oratory of Léon Blum and Marcel Sembat, champions of conservative and parliamentary Socialism, nor the carefully planned efforts of Paul-Boncour, Varenne and Pressemanne, who constituted a committee of resistance to halt the advances of Communism, were able to gain the Socialist delegates assembled at Tours for their views. The Congress voted to march under the flag of the Third International. There is no question that strenuous efforts will be made to capture the scattered and strewn forces of the C. G. T. after its dissolution.

Last fall careful Paris observers noted that Bolshevism had no chance to win over this organization of French workers to its cause, in spite of its well-known radicalism and its attempt at a general strike last May. The reason for this was the anti-Bolshevist attitude of Merrheim whose powerful influence over the members of the C. G. T. was unquestioned. In a series of articles he attacked the Soviet regime. His action was the more remarkable since his reputation had always been that of a radical of the extreme left. However, the decree of dissolution materially altered the situation.

For this reason, however great a menace C. G. T. may have been to the State, the wisdom of this *coup de force* by the Government, at this time, is called into question. Policies of suppression have always had serious consequences. Nothing proves this better than the very history of labor in France, from the period after the French Revolution up to the law of 1884. Against such doubts it is recalled that Millerand is at the helm of State. He surprised the world in October, 1910, when together with Briand and Viviani he broke the force of the general strike which was started by the railroad

workers, by ordering the militarization of the railroads and calling all the strikers to the colors. To understand what this meant it should be remembered that Etienne Millerand, his father, an active disciple of Marx, met his death in the Commune of 1871. Millerand himself imbibed the teachings of radicalism from his father, defended them for years as editor of the organ of the Socialist Left, *La Petite République* and later as the editor of the *La Lanterne*, and in 1906 was instrumental in having a law passed which permitted the C. G. T. the possession of such properties as was needed for its purposes and granted to it the right of incorporation under the laws of the land—all this for an organization whose declared program of action was the general strike. Later, by his unexpected stroke, he cut the heart out of the strike by declaring that he "would not permit the nation to be tyrannized by labor." He is the strong man of France. Last May the force of his tactics also broke the back of the general strike in France, which threatened to revolutionize the country. In his career he has been the political chameleon of France—changing the hues of his political opinions and his tactics according to the difficulty in which he finds himself. Not otherwise is Aristide Briand, the present Prime Minister. A doctrinaire in his younger days he preached the general strike in the following words:

"Citizens, the general strike is that for which I assume sponsorship. I believe confidently that the general strike will be the revolution. March into battle, if necessary, even with swords, pistols and guns. Long live the revolution."

He would not espouse views like these today. Like Millerand he fished in the various waters of opportunist politics, and he found it a profitable pastime. And today, he is Prime Minister.

Against clever, versatile and power-loving men like these, Socialism in France presents far from a united front. It is split into four factions: the Conservatives, the polite, elegant, polished, parlor Socialists, who are content to let the social revolution develop through the process of evolution, led by Blum and Sembat; the Reconstructionists, the faithful adherents of Marx, defenders, indeed, of the principles of the Third International but opponents of all dictatorial, *sine qua non* orders issued from the Kremlin, led by Longuet; the Communists, who have no country except it be the world, no flag except it be the battle banner of red, led by the Moscow enthusiasts, Frossard and Cachin; and the Revolutionists, a small group of minor importance, who would like to see the revolution break out in France *toute de suite*, today sooner than tomorrow, led by the youthful hot-head Paul Louis. Added to these come the Syndicalists of the C. G. T., who in the past have had nothing but words of scorn for the parliamentary tactics of the Socialist parties.

If the Government succeeds in keeping differences between these various groups sharp and keen, if it carefully avoids all that might weld these heterogeneous elements of revolution into a compact, homogeneous mass of action, Socialism in France has not a bright outlook in the near future. A revolution sweeping into Western Europe from Russia is its only chance of success.

Free Speech and the Movies

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

THE demand for censorship of the moving-picture is now nation-wide. There is some fanaticism back of this demand, which is almost a "drive" in its dogged intensity, but, fundamentally, the movement is a protest against the exploitation of vice for commercial purposes. In the trade and out of it, decent men are agreed that some form of censorship or regulation is imperative, for it is an unfortunate fact that the trade is infested with men whose moral standards barely approximate the standards of the professional procurer. Conditions are so deplorable that, in their opinion, State or Federal censorship is the only remedy. The plan which they propose differs in detail according to local needs. Essentially, however, it means "pre-release censorship"; that is, all films must be reviewed and approved by a State or Federal Board before they can be exhibited to the public.

Now this plan might or might not destroy the improper film. But the question of prime importance is: Is it practicable? Let us grant that graft, politics, and bribery would never influence the appointment of the

censors, or their decisions. Let us grant, further, that the moral standards of the censors would be generally acceptable, and their judgment such as to recommend itself to all good citizens. But has pre-release censorship a place in America? My first-hand acquaintance, which is not small, both with the evils of the trade and the wiles of producers and exhibitors does not prevent me from venturing an answer in the negative.

The Lusk bill, probably to be passed by the New York Assembly, is built on the pre-release censorship principle. In providing that no picture may be shown in public unless first approved by a State Board, the bill flatly contradicts, in my opinion, a principle embodied in the Federal Constitution, and in the constitution of every State in the Union. This principle sets forth my right as a citizen to express my "sentiments" freely "on all subjects," being always responsible for the abuse of this right. Moreover, it not only forbids the enactment of any law which destroys free speech, but of any law which abridges it.

Every citizen may freely speak, write, and publish his sentiments on all subjects, being responsible for the abuse of that right; and no law shall be passed to restrain or abridge the liberty of speech or of the press. (Constitution of the State of New York, section I.)

In varying form this section has appeared in all the constitutions of the State of New York, from 1777 to the present time.

From the plain wording of the section, it is clear that the right can be abused. The very men who wrote it, and the people who approved it, knew that the right would be abused by evil men to tear down the civil, moral and political structure they had built. Yet in spite of this knowledge, they established freedom of speech "on all subjects" as a constitutional right, placing all tampering with it beyond reach of the executive, the Assembly and the courts, because they knew that without it a free government of free men is an impossibility. What they wrote in this section is no empty declamation. They meant it.

It is urged, however, by friends of the Clayton-Lusk bill that State regulation of the moving-picture is not an act in restraint of free speech, but an act to control a licensed business. Evidence is not submitted to show that an act to control a licensed business is justified, even when it destroys free speech, and I find myself wholly unable to accept this view. The section above quoted refers to a right of the people with which the Assembly is forbidden to interfere. Its obvious purpose is to safeguard the right of "every citizen" to communicate "freely" to others "his sentiments on all subjects." In pursuance of this purpose the section enumerates two methods by which a sentiment may be communicated: speaking and writing. But the specific enumeration of these methods should not be construed to exclude any and all other methods. In recognition of the fact that a sentiment may, or at some future time might, be communicated in another manner, the section adds a term of general import, to "publish," that is, to make known in an intelligible manner. It cannot, therefore, be seriously urged that the section safeguards freedom in the communication of thought in two cases only, "writing" and "speaking," and withholds this freedom when the communication is published in any other manner.

An example may point this argument. I propose to communicate my "sentiments" to the public. I set them forth in an editorial, a poem, a short-story, or a cantata. These sentiments may be blasphemous, obscene, offensive to decent-living men, even subversive of all law and order. Nevertheless I am not obliged and cannot be obliged, even were I an habitual offender, to submit them to a State censor, because the Constitution protects my right as a citizen freely to "publish" my sentiments "on all subjects." State regulation can begin only after the fact of publication, by holding me responsible, when evidence is offered that I have abused my constitutional

right. In like manner, if instead of printing my sentiments, I prefer to publish them in a speech, I cannot be obliged to submit my manuscript to the police, or to hold a rehearsal for a board of censors.

This, I think, will be granted. But if granted, I can find no valid reason why my constitutional right to publish my sentiments freely on all subjects should be denied if I elect to publish them in a moving-picture. I hold that my right to do this cannot be denied or abridged without destroying the constitutional guaranty of free speech.

But the manufacture, sale and exhibition of the moving-picture, it is said, is a licensed business. Granted. The accidental circumstance that I may wish to sell the finished expression of my sentiments cannot be wrested to destroy a right. Even Shakespeare went into the market, and orators, novelists, editors, lecturers, singers, and public entertainers very commonly sell their sentiments externalized by means of print, the human voice, or the phonograph record. But no one has ever urged seriously: You may give your books away, or your newspapers, or your magazines, or you may lecture or sing or act for the public, *free of charge*. Then we cannot interfere with your right to publish your sentiments on all subjects. But if you prepare a manuscript with the intention of selling it, or act or sing or lecture in a licensed hall, charging an admission-fee, then the section means nothing for you. You must submit your manuscript to State censors who will give or withhold, as they deem fit, permission to print; or, as the case may be, you must first rehearse your speeches, lectures, or songs, before the censors.

If to publish my sentiments does not mean to communicate them in any way that is intelligible to human beings, then as a constitutional guarantee, the free-speech sections of the Federal and State Constitutions are worthless. They may, possibly, protect my right to utter my sentiments by word of mouth or on paper. They destroy that right when I prefer to utter them on celluloid. And if the State can require me to submit my celluloid manuscript to censors, on the plea that I intend to sell the pictured manifestation of my thought, it must be admitted that the State can compel me to submit my manuscript, or my act, to censors unless I agree to give the externalized product to the public without cost.

To put the moving-picture beyond the pale of this constitutional right on the ground that it is an article of commerce, may or may not check the evils of the trade. But it most certainly is a movement most dangerous to all civil liberty.

Let the obvious now be added, that the present state of the moving-picture industry is nothing less than disgraceful. It needs reform, but in a constitutional government, a reform must be effected in a constitutional manner or it cannot be effected at all. The men back of the trade may be thugs, panderers and cut-throats, but even a felon has his day in court, and unless the con-

stitutional forms are observed, he cannot be punished. Legislation of the Clayton-Lusk type will do infinitely more harm than good. Any law restraining or abridging the liberty of speech or of the press is unconstitutional and utterly out of harmony with American principles and procedure. Yet I venture to believe that all the constitutional sections which safeguard this precious right of free speech, provide a remedy in the provision that all citizens shall be held responsible for its abuse. If laws to punish the immoral producer or exhibitor do not exist, let them be enacted. If they are not enforced, then nothing less than an awakened and purified public consciousness will cure the evil. The steady, combined efforts of our religious, educational and social organizations will do much to awaken that consciousness. But it is certain that reforms cannot be secured by enacting legislation which destroys a constitutional right.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters as a rule should not exceed six hundred words.

The Pilgrims and the Puritans

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The first compendious history of the United States, issued in Keene, New Hampshire, was published by John Prentiss, a brother of the author, Charles Prentiss, an American, in 1820. The compiler spent some time on this initial attempt to get out a complete history, and consulted all known authorities up to the time of his death, which occurred the year the history appeared. Now, in this first history of the United States (there were histories of North America issued, of course, before Prentiss' time) I was interested to see what this historian of a century ago had to say about the landing of the Pilgrims, so-called, at Plymouth. Strange to say he does not mention the term once in his description. Here is a pertinent extract (page 25:)

The Rev. Mr. Robinson with his flock, of the Reformed Church of the North of England, usually denominated *Puritans* (italics inserted) removed to Amsterdam in 1606, and soon after to Leyden. A variety of motives led his congregation to turn their attention to the new world: the principal were the enjoyment of perfect liberty of conscience; the preservation of ecclesiastical affairs distinct from those of the State; and a hope of laying a foundation for an extensive empire that should be purged from all religious impurities. . . . 1620, a part of the congregation, who were to cross the Atlantic and make preparation for the rest, left Leyden in July, and sailed from Southampton in England in August, . . . at daybreak on the 9th of November they discovered Cape Cod.

Now, Prentiss compiled his history for the benefit of common schools and academies. In his preface he says:

I have found much discrimination necessary in the history of the individual States, in selecting either the most interesting or most important items. [Prentiss was an editor and writer by occupation.] My best judgment has, however, been diligently and laboriously exercised in the execution of this task.

Once again Dr. Walsh's contention that the Pilgrims were really Puritans is substantiated. I was wondering whether Mr. Lendrum, the Southern defender of the Pilgrims, had seen Prentiss's history. The last time I spoke with Dr. Walsh was some few weeks ago. At that time the doctor was disposed to "let the thing [the Pilgrim-Puritan controversy] drop." But I trust that the editor of AMERICA will decide differently. There is much interesting and comparatively unknown material that can be dug up at this particular time, when the Pilgrim tribe are resurrecting their long-buried ancestors. Here is a fine time,

an opportune time, to obliterate the meaningless term *Pilgrims*, considered as a proper name or noun. And also a time to give the Puritans their due.

Lowell, Mass.

GEORGE F. O'DWYER

Interest on Money.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In his letter in the issue of AMERICA for April 2 Dr. Ryan suggests the assertion that the justice of taking interest on capital "has been thoroughly discussed and the liability firmly established," needs considerable qualification. He admits that by his own solution he has solved the practical but not the speculative doubt on the subject. In my original letter I did not use the word liability, but liceity, and had no intention of entering into the speculative discussion.

The eminent doctor refers to the moral axiom, "*Res fructificat domino*" (a thing fructifies to its owners), as a mere formula. Unless I am sadly mistaken this axiom is held sacred by all moralists. It means that if I own a plant, I have a right to the flowers which blossom thereon; if I have trees, mine is the fruit: if I possess cattle, the offspring is mine. It is on this principle that the moralists justify interest on money; because, namely, money today is *frugifera*, fruitbearing. If money is fruitful, *a fortiori* industrial capital, machinery, etc., are fruitbearing.

Dr. Coffey in the article to which Dr. Ryan refers, admits the right of the owner of industrial capital to some unearned income, on the title of ownership, but objects to the present-day system of capitalism which absorbs all and enslaves the worker.

Let me add one word about the solution of the practical doubt. Though extrinsic authority is sufficient to solve a doubt practically—i. e., if I have a scruple about the justice of a certain act or procedure, I may without understanding the speculative reasons for its justice, act on the judgment of moralists—it must be borne in mind that there must be speculative reasons somewhere, e. g. with the moralists.

New York.

HENRY A. JUDGE, S.J.

Labor Value Theory.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

It is evident that Rev. H. A. Judge, S.J., in AMERICA of March 19, intended to limit his observations on the labor-value theory, but the explanation of the points raised requires considerable space. It is submitted that interest on capital is not an injustice, but is the evidence of injustice. When the general rate of profit is increased, the rate of interest is increased. High profits are commonly recognized as unjust. High-interest rates reflect high profits. Prices are not high because interest is paid; interest is paid because prices are high. For example, if an individual is enabled to produce a commodity at a considerably less cost than the price he believes he can secure for it, he will borrow capital in order to extend its production. But he will not pay more than the market rate. When the capitalists of a community are competing for capital in order to produce goods for an exceedingly profitable market, competition for capital increases the rate of interest. Of course, the increased rate of interest does not increase the selling price of the goods. A producer with an abundance of capital of his own would charge the same price for his wares as would the man paying either a high or a low rate of interest for his capital. The injustice is in the acquirement of a high-priced market for low-cost goods, which is the sole source of interest on capital. The nature of profitable markets has been outlined in several articles in AMERICA.

I wish I could make it understood that to bolster up any Socialist theory is farthest from any thoughts. If there is any complaint against my presentation of the labor-value theory, it ought not to come from the anti-Socialists, as the following extended quotation from the writings of John Spargo will indicate:

One of the most common misconceptions of the theory, a misconception which has served as the basis of many criticisms, is that which regards it as involving the ethics of distribution. The usual statement is that the theory of Marx leads to the conclusion that "All wealth is produced by labor, and should, therefore, belong to labor." It is then assumed that in the Socialist State an ethical system of distribution will be realized, based upon the labor-value theory, and that each worker will get approximately the value of his own labor product, minus his share in the necessary social charges. There is nothing in the Marxian theory to support either the statement or the assumption based upon it. Marx nowhere reasons that the workers *ought* to get the full value of their labor. Indeed, as Engels points out, Marx opposed the earlier Socialists of the Ricardian school for confusing economics with ethics. He based his whole argument for Socialism, not upon the right of the producers, but upon the impossibility of the capitalist system to last, the inevitability of the development of capitalist industry to the point where the industrial and legal forms of capitalism can no longer contain it. Marx invariably scoffed at the "ethical distribution" idea, and when the Gotha Platform of the German Socialists was adopted in 1875, he was very much incensed, not only because he regarded its opening sentence, "Labor produces all wealth," as wrong in itself, but because it seemed to him to lead directly to the old idea that Socialism must rest its case upon the right of the producer to the whole of his product, instead of upon the inevitable breakdown of capitalist society.

Because of Spargo's present position in relation to the Socialist party, the foregoing would have little weight, but it also represents substantially what is at present being taught in the Rand School and on the Socialist lecture platform, as was brought to my attention within a week; the lecturer going so far as to affirm that if all capital were freely turned over to society under present conditions, there could be a gain to the workers of between ten and twenty per cent only.

The value of labor is determined by the quantity of labor that the worker will expend for the production of anything. The thing produced represents the value of the labor expended. Even if the worker "digs a hole in his back yard," the same rule holds. If there is no value to the hole, there is no value to the labor. If you then conclude that the labor-value theory is meaningless and ineffective in indicating a system of production and distribution tending to the general welfare, why, tell it to the Socialist, but do not deny the truth of the theory.

There is no difference between the scholastics' use of the word "riches" and the Socialists' use of that word. Riches, or wealth is measured by abundance. Two bushels of wheat represents more wealth than one bushel. A great wheat crop represents great wealth, but a short crop is apt to have more value. That is, value is attributable to scarcity, "difficulty of attainment." A short crop may represent more expended labor than an abundant crop. It is the labor necessary of attainment that causes the excessive value per bushel when there is a shortage. Men generally do not dig valueless holes, they apply their labor in order that they may acquire values to correspond to the value they place upon their efforts.

Let it be understood that "value" means "exchange value," which is represented by the market price of a commodity. While all goods having an exchange value must possess utility of use-value to the buyer, it is the exchange value, or the cost of production, which determines the price, and that is what interests us. A distinction between riches and value, together with the acknowledgment that labor is not the only source of wealth, or abundance of goods, is presented by Marx in the following:

It is strikingly clear, that means of production never transfer more value to the product than they themselves lose during the labor-process by the destruction of their own use-values. If such an instrument has no value to lose, if, in other words, it is not the product of human labor, it transfers no value to the product. It helps to create use-value without contributing to the formation of exchange value. In this class are included all means of production supplied

by nature without human assistance, such as land, wind, water, metals *in situ*, and timber in virgin forests.

This quotation has particular application to the supposition of a crop growing spontaneously on one's property. If it was a phenomenon peculiar to that land, such a crop would have a value equal to the cost of producing a similar quantity on other less favored land. But if a crop was not partial to where it grew in its spontaneity, it would be found necessary for the owners of the land to pay for its removal; that is, it would have no value in exchange; it would be the free product of nature.

It would seem that this discussion is purely speculative and vain, and it is agreed that the reward of labor till the end of time will be determined by bargaining; but my purpose has been to indicate a method of fair bargaining that will bring about an approximately just relation between capitalists and workers, and that is the antithesis of Socialism

Providence.

M. F. CONNERY

The Incarnation and Character

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Even though a recent book, notable with thoughtful questions and suggestions, "The Christian Mind," by Dom Vonier, merits a special "review" note in your columns, may I call attention to one of the worthy queries in the book, and then subjoin a newspaper account of a recent happening,—a dramatic scene, not fictional, one eloquent in its response to one of Dom Vonier's questions. Having asked about the behavior of a man "in whom the Son of God is an actual and pulsating fact," the author proceeds with his interrogation:

And more generally, how far is the Incarnation capable of producing a specific character, a specific mind, in the people who believe it all literally, without any reservations? Is there, or can there be, here on earth, a race of men and women whose characters, whose minds, are not only modified, but are actually created by sincere and living belief in the Son of God, so that a great dramatist could place them in some heroic play, as he could be quite certain of the workings of such characters?

Indeed the question is fraught with suggestion: history has records to tell in response, some glorious, some, alas, inglorious, like those of certain peoples in the sixteenth century, "who made the great denial." The response of the Irish nation is no conjecture: "Heaven sees it, earth knows it," said Lacordaire in his famous eulogy in Notre Dame. I do not wish to put a fringe upon the eloquence that has described that story of Ireland; I merely wish to repeat, by way of response to the question, some sentences out of a narration of the scene which attended the execution of six Irishmen at the Dublin gallows; and I take the words from the New York Times of March 15:

Forty thousand persons gathered around Mountjoy Prison yesterday morning to await the execution of the six young men. . . . The scene was extraordinarily impressive. The crowd began assembling at dawn, and by 6 o'clock the prison yard was packed. An hour later the crowd had filled the roadway leading to the prison and all the abutting streets. An altar had been improvised near the prison-yard; sacred images and pictures had been placed. Everywhere candles were burned, scores of persons in the heart of the dense throng holding them aloft through the long vigil. Here and there priests led in prayers and hymns in which all joined earnestly. Hundreds kneeling in the roadway were forced to rise when an armored car urged its way through the crowd. . . . No hint had reached the watching multitude of the grim proceedings going on in a distant wing of the big prison; but hourly, beginning at 6 o'clock, the rosary was recited. Every church was crowded at Masses celebrated after the executions for the repose of the souls of the six men.

Here in answer to Dom Vonier's question, is a scene which a great dramatist could place in some heroic play: it is a page out of Ireland's heroic-sized volume of glorious conduct.

Worcester.

MICHAEL EARLS, S.J.

A M E R I C A

A · CATHOLIC · REVIEW · OF · THE · WEEK

SATURDAY, APRIL 16, 1921

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at Special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by The America Press, New York.
President, RICHARD H. TIERNNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSEIN;
Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BREEN.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 Europe, \$5.00

Address:

THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

The American Commission on Conditions in Ireland, which for the past five months has been gathering evidence on conditions in Ireland, has published an interim report, setting forth its findings to date and its appraisal of the situation. Funds are needed to pay for the printing and distribution of this report. Contributions may be sent to Royal W. France, Treasurer, 120 Broadway, New York City.

Our Paternalistic Government

THE Secretary of the Treasury announces his need of billions of dollars. He is not sure how he will get them or when. But he knows perfectly well from whom he will get them. The American people, you and I and the Smiths, are his bank from which he draws when Congress countersigns the check. And when the reserve falls, Congress calls upon us to raise the level. If we refuse, we may be jailed, and the costs of our detention are paid in the usual manner.

After 132 years of experiment, it ought to be fairly clear that there is no way of getting something from the Government for nothing. The case is rather the other way around. Every penny the Government has, it takes from the people, principally from the poor. Yet there is no delusion more common than the delusion that a social or economic reform can always be brought about promptly by the Federal Government, free of charge, or at a nominal cost. Hence we are asked to welcome Federal maternity centers, Federal schools, Federal pensions for crippled tramps, Federal old-age pensions, Federal road-building plans, and Federal bureaus to deprive our unfortunate children of their adenoids, giving them in return a Federal tooth-brush. It is not denied that a tooth-brush is a desirable tool. The quarrel turns on the matter of a *Federalized* tooth-brush.

A few old-fashioned persons assert that the Federal tooth-brush is usually an inferior article. They also say that it costs more than the best of its kind, bought in the open market. Further, they allege that if a father cannot raise the price of a tooth-brush by his own honest toil, or if he is indifferent to its social and hygienic value, it would be necessary to appoint a Federal police-

man to see that the child used it. In any case, despite the inter-State commerce clause of the Constitution, it is no business of the Federal Government to furnish its citizens either with tooth-brushes or dentists.

These, however, are antiquated views. Yet in these efficiency days it is worth while to ask who will pay for these Federal excursions into the realm of paternalism. Justice Holmes of the Supreme Court has recently written his regret that nowadays taxes are too much disguised. If the people realized, writes the learned Justice, that taxes fall chiefly upon the working men and the fighting men of the community, they would be slower to call for Federal legislation, distributing to all corners thirty-cent tooth-brushes or thirty-cent schools, at a net price of one dollar.

Humiliating the Ambassador

THE British Ambassador at Washington needs a new press agent. Sir Auckland Geddes is an accomplished gentleman against whose private character the voice of criticism has never been raised. But by his awkward handling of British brutalities in Ireland, Sir Auckland, or the individual who writes Sir Auckland's press-notice, not only makes an indefensible case indescribably worse, but unjustly ranks the Ambassador with a class of persons whom society generally clothes in stripes and keeps in strict confinement. The latest instance of *gaucherie* was spread on the pages of the daily press, when an answer to the Interim Report of the American Commission on Conditions in Ireland was sanctioned by the Embassy.

Sir Auckland's sole reply is that Great Britain needs Ireland in order to maintain the integrity of the Empire. Any malefactor, grown powerful on ill-gotten gains, might offer the same defense. He cannot make restitution in one case, because he might thus be forced to make restitution in all; and if he must give up his plunder what will become of the empire his stolen wealth has created for him? The prime question is not what Great Britain "needs," but what an oppressed people are entitled to demand and receive. Sir Auckland makes the controversy turn on the "right" of the British Empire to force its rule upon an unwilling people. Americans make the controversy turn on the right of a people to that form of government which they themselves elect. If a glimmering of this truth has entered the mind of the Ambassador, addressing himself to the American people, it has not been permitted to illumine a single sentence of his reply.

"For seven centuries," we are told, "Great Britain has been endeavoring to pacify Ireland." Again is the Embassy forced to draw from the vocabulary of crime. My property is my own, no matter how long I may be forced to fight for it, nor does it belong to the assailant even if in the struggle the thief becomes a murderer. After seven hundred years of "pacification" conditions

are worse than ever. The conclusion which a majority of Americans will draw from the Ambassador's astounding confession is that if after seven hundred years of bloody rapine England cannot conquer the Irish, it is high time for England to withdraw.

Illiterate Patriots

THE advocates of Federalized education do not allow us to forget that, according to the Surgeon-General's report, about one-fourth of our citizen-soldiers in the late war were "practically" illiterate. This fact, if fact it be, may show either that some States do not take their educational tasks with a proper degree of seriousness, or that conditions have arisen with which they cannot as yet cope. But it does not show that "education has broken down within the States." Much less does it prove that all is lost unless the Federal Government is allowed to control education.

However much this alleged illiteracy may be deplored, one fact is certain. These illiterate soldiers were at their post of duty. They could not write in any language, but they helped to write a glorious page in history. They could not read a single paragraph of the Constitution of the United States, but they could do something better. They could obey it, and they could fight for it, and they did both. Every man among them risked all for his country, and some of them made the supreme sacrifice. But it should never be forgotten that, according to the Beta test, about one-fourth of them were illiterate.

Among the Prussians, illiteracy was almost negligible. This is also true of our American slackers. The most notable examples were anything but illiterate. They were lecturers, writers, directors of social-science schools, manufacturers, and rich men's sons. One was clever enough to persuade the War Department to open the prison-doors to let him search for a pot of gold, hidden in the mountains of Maryland. After that, the Government of the United States was forced to apologize to the German Government when two American soldiers tried to capture the slacker. As the examples come to mind, it would appear that the percentage of illiteracy among the slackers closely approximated 0.02, or about that of the Prussian brigades. Of the Americans who fought for their country, about one-fourth were illiterates. The comparison is illuminating. By the American test, these men were satisfactory. By the Beta test, they were not.

Literacy is a desirable thing in a republic. The more genuine education among the people the better. But good citizenship does not follow literacy as dawn follows the darkness. Knowledge does not make character. We have all gone a bit mad in arguing as if instruction in reading and writing and civics, or even a college training, necessarily creates American citizens. A return to sanity is indicated, even if the return means that some arguments for Federal control of activities which do not belong to the Federal Government must be abandoned.

"One Hundred Cords of Wood" And Charity

THE following extraordinary letter, with enclosure of fifty dollars, was recently received at this office:

I am a subscriber to AMERICA since 1913 and like to read your editorials. As to your many appeals for the starving, I sent my first contributions a year ago in March [Appeal for Vienna] and decided from that time on to give one-tenth of my wages to this cause. Later in Summer (August) I succeeded in getting a contract cutting cord-wood (which work others did not want), all of which is over-time work, done evenings, at which I was working each week, somewhat hampered by wind and snow. At present over 100 cords of wood are cut and split. All the pay for this goes for the starving (do no over-time for any other reason). Local charity and relatives I help out of my regular wages which is 4 Dollars a day, laboring in a mining-camp. Have given to Armenian Relief Fund, and others, but mainly to starving children in Austria. Amounts were sent to Quakers, to Baby Fund, to AMERICA (for the aged in Vienna) and this present one to apply as you see fit. Have contributed \$60 monthly to Hoover drive for four months. My native land, Tyrol, received nothing at all so far, as all is aimed for the poorest of the poor.

I was hoping to make amounts given reach the 1000 Dollar mark this Summer, as I am around 600 now, but it probably will not happen, as I have been stopped this month, at least temporarily, as there is no need for any wood at present. I am feeling very sorry as it became almost a hobby for me to do this work. There is much said about unemployment and needs in this country, but I know that people are in far worse condition and entirely helpless on the other side. I was dead broke, having not one cent of my own as late as 1917. All this writing may seem like a little boasting but I felt like telling it to some one, and none but the sender knows.

And Almighty God. He has promised life everlasting to all who in His Name, minister to His suffering children. He will not forget, He the merciful Father of all, who watches over the fledgling in its nest, the lamb in the fold, the babe in its mother's arms. Blessed are the merciful, and the man whose ears are open to the cry of the wretched. On the last great day when we shall all stand before Him to receive the desert of our deeds, surely this poor worker in a mining-camp will find his "100 cords of wood cut and split" one good title for admission into the Kingdom of God.

A Dreadful Doll

A FRESH peril menaces our helpless children. It is reported that the toy market will soon be flooded with a moderately priced doll possessing all but human attributes. For this new toy, which looks just like a small child, is not only able to move its eyes, head, and hands and to walk from place to place, but the perverse ingenuity of its inventor has actually endowed this dreadful doll with the faculty of speech, so that the automaton can actually talk for an hour at a time, sing songs and do other uncanny vocal tricks. Truly, was ever the like heard of?

Strong measures should at once be taken to protect our little ones from this monster, for the dangerous possibilities of talking dolls can easily be imagined. Heartless parents, for instance, can now fill their offspring's

innocent-looking toys with records of so hopelessly "improving" a character that Madge and Margery, during the time ostensibly devoted to play, may be forced to listen to long discourses on the turpitude of disobedience, to Rollo-like instructions on how to tell the birds from the flowers, or to verses by Dr. Watts on the busy bee's aversion to wasting time, or on the beauty of domestic harmony. These talking dolls may even become a peril to our children's spiritual life. Suppose a mother's mistaken piety, for example, makes her charge her helpless little daughter's marvelous toy with entire pages from a hymnal, a prayer-book, or the catechism, so that a child who hitherto has always fondly associated dolls with the most delightful amusement there is, suddenly finds herself basely betrayed into taking part in long religious exercises, and seeing her play-hours cruelly turned into a sort of daily Sunday-school. Would it be at all surprising if such a child should grow up to be a woman of little piety and with scant interest in the souls of the heathen?

In spite of the innundation of talking dolls that threat-

ens our nurseries, the future, nevertheless, is not without its ray of hope. For children, as we know, are of a very inquiring habit of mind, and burn with an insatiable eagerness to trace all effects down to their primal causes. So there are good grounds for hoping that few of these highly complicated dolls will retain the use of their faculties very long. For each little girl who finds herself the awe-struck owner of a talking doll, will be restored before long to "normalcy" in all probability, will institute a thorough investigation of the sources of the toy's uncanny gifts and the upshot will be that that particular doll will never talk again. Then Madge or Margery will cherish with renewed affection, no doubt, her discarded rag-doll to which the magic of make-believe will give a thousand wonderful qualities that even the most perfect automaton can never, never have. Thus will this insidious attack on the imaginations of all the little girls in the land be happily frustrated. For a doll that leaves nothing for a child's fancy to supply is calculated to spoil in their cradles the poets, artists and idealists of tomorrow.

Literature

"DEAR PRUE'S" HUSBAND

TO THACKERAY, the portrayer of Queen Anne's day, we are under heavy obligations. Where could a happier conception be found than his picture of Sir Richard Steele when Sir Richard was just Little Dick, schooling at Charter House, thick-set, square-faced, black-eyed, interminably idle, frequently flogged, getting into debt with the tart woman, the lolly-pop vender, and the pieman, and eloping from bounds on all occasions! This picture is good enough to be true, for Little Dick was a lovable lad despite his faults, as surely as in manhood he was still faulty and still lovable.

Born in Dublin in March, 1672, Steele was of one age with his later associates, Addison and Colley Cibber, and five years younger than the redoubtable Jonathan Swift. After passing through Charter House School he entered Oxford but left without taking a degree to enlist in the Duke of Ormond's regiment and afterwards, by his poem "The Procession," to win the patronage of that able soldier, Lord Cutts.

These army years were merry ones for the young soldier who gambled and drank and consorted with the most dashing bucks of the town, always with a handsome scarlet coat to his back and a military swagger which he carried off as well as his chubby body would allow. There was a fly, however, in Steele's ointment. His conscience troubled him over acts which were common enough to his age and profession and he struggled valiantly for amendment. It was typical of Steele that his good resolutions frequently fell short, for he was very human, this stout little soldier-secretary to Lord Cutts, and he continued to make—and break—good resolutions all his life.

His success with "The Procession" led him to try his hand at the drama and after scoring some success on the stage with "The Funeral," "The Lying Lover," and "The Tender Husband," he found himself well known in the great world of London, accepted as a peer by the gay spirits at Wills and admitted to the dazzling coterie which made the Kit-Cat Club famous.

Successful thus far he must needs venture upon matrimony. Of his first wife, however, we know little except that she was reputed wealthy and died within a year. Gossip said that there was more than a casual connection between Steele's marriage to

a wealthy widow and the large sums he was reported to have squandered upon alchemy, the eighteenth-century get-rich-quick ancestor of our present-day silvers and oils. It may be suspected that gossip did him an injustice; but whether or no, it was but a few months before the dashing little soldier was again in love and pursuing the object of his ardor with the impetuosity unfailingly inspired by the great adventure.

The charmer was Mary Scurlock whom he had met, and it please you, at his first wife's funeral. Mistress Scurlock was possessed of Welsh lineage, a comfortable income, striking good looks, and twenty-nine years, five of which she was later to disavow in her marriage license. It was quite in character for Steele, to whom the fair sex was an object of Quixotic adoration, to declare his passion in a grandiloquent strain.

The vainest Woman upon Earth, [he writes] never saw in Her Glasse half the attractions which I view in you. Your Air, your Shape, your Every glance, Motion and Gesture have such peculiar Graces that you possesse my whole Soul. I know not what to say but that I Love you with the Sincerest passion that ever enter'd the Heart of Man.

Although Steele declared in one of his missives that a great passion makes us dumb, he appears to have been voluble enough and bombarded the beauty with ardent *billets-doux*. After an admirable show of reluctance she yielded and when at last the great event is arranged Dick cries: "Oh, hasten, Ye Minutes! bring on the happy Morning wherein to be ever her's will make me look down on thrones! Dear Molly, I am tenderly, passionately, faithfully thine."

At length the happy morning arrived and Richard's ardors received their reward. But with more than a drop of Don Quixote in his blood, he found the cares of things mundane not slow in creeping into his Paradise. Returns from his first wife's West Indian plantations and his hopes from his second wife's estate in Wales proved disappointing and evoked the ghost of that financial worry which was never far absent from his feast and which his own improvidence did little to banish. His indiscretions indeed were not infrequent; he installed his mother-in-law as a member of his household, got into political quarrels with cleverer men than himself, and spent money faster than he

could earn it. But through it all he persisted in writing *billets-doux* to his wife, and for that the succeeding generations which love great men for being human have called him blessed. Sometimes she is "Dear Wife," again, "Dear Ruler" (significant act of homage), but oftenest "Dear Prue." Mostly these *billets* are dashed off in a hurry, sometimes from the tavern, again from the anteroom of a noble lord, and on other occasions from the office of the *Gazette*, to the editorship of which he had been appointed through the influence of friends.

On one occasion he is to spend the night "over against the Devill Tavern at Charing Crosse," and adjures her to "let Mrs. Todd send by the Boy my Night-Gown, Slippers & clean Linen." On another occasion he opens up his missive with a fervent declaration that she can never disapprove of him save for being "hers devotedly," tucking into a postscript, as if by afterthought, the real purpose of his note: "I shan't come home till night." Some of these scribbles betray misunderstandings but in all of them Dick, even when justice is on his side, is obviously where dear Prue succeeded in placing him, on the defensive.

Some missives apologize for engagements unkept, others divulge his high hopes for a stroke of business which will swell his purse to bursting. Again he is spending the night at Sandy-End with "Mr. Addison" and still again he is recommending "Thee, my Heart's Desire, to the Good God who made thee that Amiable Creature thou Art to keep thee safe and happy." Whether his Heart's Desire accepted his excuses for nocturnal tardiness without investigation we cannot say. But when he writes an apologetic note about being detained to dine with friends and concludes it with the pathetic plea, "Dear Prue, Don't send after me for I shall be ridiculous," one's doubts will not down.

In the meantime Steele's days are a round of work. He slaves at the *Gazette* office, dabbles in business ventures, most of which turn out badly, seeks political preferment, dodges bailiffs, and indites epistles to "Dear Prue," who, for the most part, stays in the suburbs out of the way of her husband's difficulties.

At length Fortune smiled; for the year 1709 marked the birthday of the *Tatler* to which he and his "ingenious friend Mr. Addison" were the principal contributors and which made a tremendous hit. It was succeeded by the even more celebrated *Spectator*, the reason for whose suspension after a brilliant existence of twenty-one months is even yet a mystery. The quiet and diplomatic Addison was swept by the flood-tide of these successes into fame, political office, and the arms of a woman of wealth and title, while Steele, though he attained a seat in Parliament and the honor of matching lances against the redoubtable Dean Swift, found himself in the shoals of political acrimony and financial embarrassment. Bright days followed but did not last long; for Dame Fortune, like "Dear Prue," was nothing if not fickle and looked on Steele now with tender smiles and now with haughty disdain.

In the summer of 1716 "Dear Prue" betook herself to Wales to look after her property, leaving her husband and children lonely behind her. During the eighteen months of her absence Steele wrote her by nearly every post—she is still "Dear Prue"—the same old charming and tender letters. They had a new subject for mention, the children. He tells her how Eugene "makes the most shrewd remarks upon the pictures" in his father's "Virgil"; how Molly has the small-pox; what gravity, Betty, the eldest, is assuming, and signs the letter "Your—Betty—Dick—Eugene—Molly's humble servant."

But all his tenderness could not transform dear Prue from querulous to cheerful nor defy death at his sudden coming in the latter part of 1718. The loss of her left him disconsolate just as his struggles for success left him wearied. In 1724 he took up his residence in Wales, the better to manage his wife's estates, but he was too poor a business man to play a winning game.

Gout tortured him and at fifty-three he suffered a stroke of paralysis which partially deprived him of speech and impaired his mental faculties. But his sunny nature suffered no eclipse. Often on summer evenings he would watch the country lads and lassies at their play and reward the best dancer with a new gown. It was while he joyed childlike in such peaceful scenes that death came in 1729. What his thoughts were at the last we cannot know. But perhaps as he watched some graceful girl tripping it on the village green, broken memories returned to him of another maid, whom he had loved, and among the blessings of his years he accounted best of all that of having been Dear Prue's husband.

JOSEPH J. REILLY, Ph.D.

ST. MARY MAGDALENE

She had not known what mercy was before.

Alone she lay in shamed humility,

When Love Incarnate paused beside her door,

Imparting light to eyes that could not see.

Then love sprang up aflame! She gave her all!

And wond'ring followed Him o'er starlit plain

To undreamed heights beyond sin's siren call.

What blest relief she found in purging pain!

And when beneath the crimson Cross she stood,

Drinking the dregs of sorrow to her fill,

Whilst He, who was her Life, grew white and still,

There fell full glory on her womanhood—

Then peace lay quiet on her heaving breast.

Much love she gave Him. He forgave the rest.

S. M. ST. JOHN.

REVIEWS

Thought and Expression in the Sixteenth Century. By HENRY OSBORN TAYLOR. Two Vols. New York: The Macmillan Co. \$9.00.

In these two volumes, stocked with information, the author has endeavored to round off to its natural conclusion his earlier book, "The Medieval Mind." The present work is in reality a review of the Renaissance period in all its splendors, as well as of its less engaging manifestations. Mr. Taylor avoids the term "Renaissance" because in the mind of the majority, that seems to imply that the movement he studies was a sudden and unheralded impulse of the human mind, a miraculous flowering of genius, and not the natural, if rather slow growth of preceding ages. There is no such thing as spontaneous generation. The writer of the present volume holds quite correctly, that there is no such thing as a sudden summer flowering of literary or artistic genius. A springtime, long protracted at times, and now and then driven away by the blasts of lingering winter, always precedes. The thought and expression of the sixteenth century had their forerunners in the fourteenth and thirteenth, just as this last was influenced by the rude efforts of the twelfth and the tenth. Mr. Taylor believes in the continuity of history.

"Thought and Expression in the Sixteenth Century" does not run as smoothly as "The Medieval Mind," and lacks some of its spontaneity and ease. But with lavish hand Mr. Taylor spreads before us the vast riches of the period, and brings out their sparkle and glow. Even those who delight in Roscoe's "Age of Leo X," or the many-sided studies of the Renaissance by Symonds and Pater, will turn with pleasure to Mr. Taylor's sketch of "Humanism in Italy," his pages on Poliziano, Ariosto, Tasso and his appraisal of Machiavelli and Guicciardini. He paints a lifelike picture of Luther. There are details in it which Catholics cannot approve. He says, for example, that "the Roman Church rests upon the imperfections and corruptions, as well as the needs of man," speaks of its "vain absolutisms," and asserts in contradiction with history that neither now, nor in Luther's time does its Catholicism point to the truth for truth's sake or to righteousness for the sake of righteous-

ness, and "that its soul looks to the loaves and fishes, if not of this world, then of Heaven." But he is forced to admit that even now that Church, which he says rests upon the corruptions of man, produces saints, and that Martin Luther, who was "everything from a foul-mouthed German peasant to the mightiest of religious seers, and withal the greatest German we have known," was powerless to supplant it, and that it still lives on. Men who read history, not in the light of Catholic teachings, but in that of cold facts, are very likely to conclude that the Church that withstood Luther and the Reformation can withstand any onslaught. Other appreciations of Mr. Taylor must also be received with reserve, sometimes rejected.

Mr. Taylor writing of "Thought and Expression in the Sixteenth Century" says not a word of Spain or Portugal. It is as if they were blotted off the map. We wonder why? Rabelais has a chapter dedicated to him, Rabelais, the skeptic and egotist, the unfrocked, foul-mouthed monk. Why not a few paragraphs at least, for his superior in wit, fancy, creative powers, personal character and ideals, the mighty Cervantes and his immortal Don Quixote? An educational reformer like Ramus who belonged "to the reformed religion" gets an appreciative study; why is the orthodox Catholic, Vives, ignored? The "judicious Hooker," Protestant theologian and divine and his undoubtedly strong book "On the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity," are thoroughly reviewed; Spanish Catholic theologians like Fray Luis de Leon, Fray Luis de Granada, models of purest Castilian, are omitted. So is the mighty Lope de Vega, so the great Portuguese epic poet, Luis Vaz de Camoens. These gaps make us marvel.

J. C. R.

The Crisis of the Naval War. By ADMIRAL OF THE FLEET, VISCOUNT OF SCAPA, G. C. B., O. M., C. C. V. O. With Eight Plates and Six Charts. New York: George H. Doran Co. \$7.50.

The Admiral of the British fleet has written a most entertaining story of the work accomplished by the British and American navies in combating the submarine campaign instituted by Germany early in the war. After a preliminary chapter dealing with the reorganization of the Admiralty, the author discusses with great and engaging frankness the effective work done by enemy submarines against British and Allied commerce. For the first time there are printed reliable tables which prove that, when America entered the war, Germany had brought the Allies to a point where a little more skill on the part of Teuton commanders would have thrown the balance in favor of the Central Powers. For by that time, the gross tonnage of shipping destroyed was enormous, far beyond the amount published during the war, or even suspected by the most pessimistic. However, British energy and resourcefulness not only saved the day but furnished Admiral Jellicoe matter for a fascinating story. The narration lays bare England's deficiencies, discusses methods of combat and numerous other interesting details that will appeal to men of fighting blood. The author also pays graceful tribute to the part the American fleet played in the war and is fair enough to admit and discuss the superior points in Germany's campaign. This really interesting book, distinguished by modesty and fairness alike, is closed by several appendices containing the names of important members of the Admiralty, during the different periods of the war.

G. F.

The Letters of William James. Edited by His Son HENRY JAMES. Boston: The Atlantic Monthly Press. \$10.00.

The life of William James as given in his personal letters outlines the story of a child of the second half of the nineteenth century, fostered in an atmosphere of excessive intellectual liberty, and thoroughly dominated by the scientific spirit of the times. His early home life of a truly unique kind, encouraged an exaggerated democratic spirit, by means of discussions on all sorts of subjects, carried on for the mere joy of such exercise,

with no direction towards a proper realization of what should be the main purpose in all such endeavors, the attainment of truth. This liberty of expression surely influenced the later intellectual life of William James. Before his twentieth year he had the broadness that comes of much travel and attendance at many schools; but there was little or nothing behind this broadness on which he could hang the many ideas of which he was master. From one thing to another he moved until his thirtieth year when apparently by mere accident he was given a position as instructor in Harvard College. Gifted with many of the natural virtues, widely traveled and well read in three modern languages, his rise was rapid and he soon took a prominent place among the so-called philosophers of the day.

The mental attitude of James is well illustrated in a letter to one of his critics who had based the criticism on a number of typical passages. James objected that his center of vision had not been grasped. The reader of the Letters is led to wonder if such a lover of the unique and novel, as James certainly was, ever possessed a real center of vision; ever held a true norm by which right might be measured; ever, indeed, passed beyond the stage of a diligent collector of facts, and a promoter of hypotheses resting on incomplete inductions. Certain it is he had an endless supply of generous praise for every new-fangled idea paraded in the garb of philosophy; and certain, also, it is that he designated as *epoch-making* many ideas already buried in oblivion. Despite his sincerity, one cannot help thinking him something of a quibbler and a dilettante in matters intellectual, when the following criticism of a critic is read: "Not by proving their inward incoherence does one refute philosophies, . . . but only by superseding them by other philosophies more satisfactory." Those who are engaged in the collection of intimate pictures of prominent men, or are interested in the study of letter composition, will find the reading of these letters quite useful.

P. A. M.

Democracy and the Human Equation. By ALLEYNE IRELAND. New York: E. P. Dutton. \$3.00.

The proposition that is contained in the volume under review is this: Representative government exists in America only in name. It is a survey of American governmental conditions and from the survey the author concludes that those who hold office should represent the people and not be mere delegates of the popular will. At present they are mere delegates. The true representative after taking office decides for himself what policies to follow when legislative question arises. He is not swayed by telegrams and letters from his constituents. He is elected by them to use his judgment. This is ideal representative government, the ideal in the minds of the founders of the Republic. And this ideal has been fast on the wane until today there is little left of it. The initiative, referendum, and recall are strong indications of the trend of the popular mind. The author proposes restricting the suffrage. It should be limited by an educational test and a property-holding test. He writes:

If the elective franchise is to be left as it is, if administrative technique is to remain at its present level, it is difficult to see how any substantial improvement can be effected. But if substantial improvement does not take place, nothing is more certain than this: that what the people will be called upon to undertake will not be a serious effort to reform their government, but a desperate fight to preserve it.

Mr. Ireland has gathered valuable data and argues his case well. His weakest chapter is that on "Heredity and Environment," for he makes no allowance for a spiritual faculty in man. The author's most practical conclusion is a plea for the study of government as a science. Americans have too long looked upon it as an occupation that almost any citizen can fill. Until men are trained in preparation for government office and well compensated during office tenure there can be no real efficiency in the discharge of a public trust.

G. C. T.

Across America with the King of the Belgians. By PIERRE GOEMAERE. Authorized Translation from the French by BEATRICE SORCHAN. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. \$2.00.

The author of this interesting book is an observant Belgian journalist who was in King Albert's suite during his Majesty's triumphal progress through the United States last year. Mr. Goemaere begins with the voyage from Calais in the George Washington, gives an account of the enthusiastic reception the King received in New York, and sets down his impressions of that city, writing with special enthusiasm about Broadway's electric lights. From New York the royal party went to Boston where Cardinal Mercier was awaiting the King and Queen and where "a moving ceremony never to be forgotten" took place in the Cathedral, a function which leads the author to reflect:

On this Sunday at the same hour this same Catholic Mass was being celebrated in all the cities of the earth, in the towns of distant Europe, as in those of this great America, and other parts of the world—and not only in the cities, but even in the smallest villages the same Mass, according to the same ritual and the same liturgy. . . . This Roman Catholic religion which in spite of all the persecutions and heresies has thus spread itself so extensively, does it not really possess supernatural power, even Divine?

From Boston King Albert journeyed, with occasional stops, to San Francisco while Mr. Goemaere jotted down what he thought of our manners and morals. He found Americans "not only chaste in their conduct but in their thoughts," though Reno was very hard for him to understand. The author observes that though "They condemn adultery, the Yankees are fond of divorce." Mr. Goemaere was surprised to see packages left undisturbed on the letter-boxes in the street, and when he expressed his admiration at the honesty of the public he was informed: "Yes, the American people never steal on a small scale." As do most European visitors Mr. Goemaere found our life too hurried and feverish to be thoroughly enjoyable. He thinks that "the American does not know how to live, in the philosophic sense of the term. . . . He does not know that refinement which consists in analyzing his happiness." Though the author considers Americans rather deficient still in taste and culture, he prophesies that from our land will come the great artists and authors of tomorrow. W. D.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Poor Mary Stuart.—Done to death some 300 years ago by her Protestant enemies, Mary Queen of Scots has repeatedly had to endure bitter attacks on her fair name at the hands of English writers who felt bound to bolster up the blessed Reformation by maligning this Catholic sovereign. The latest British author to drag poor Mary Stuart's name in the dust is John Drinkwater who has written a commonplace little play about her which was recently presented in New York and mercilessly scored by the leading dramatic critics. The clumsy prologue of "Mary Stuart" (Houghton Mifflin, \$1.25) introduces a youth whose wife loves another man too and whom an elderly friend tries to persuade there is no harm in that, for Mary Stuart managed to have a husband and lovers at the same time. The Queen of Scots then comes on the stage to teach the injured young husband how narrow-minded and intolerant he is, and prosy scenes are presented in which the Rizzio, Darnley and Bothwell of the old Protestant tradition are brought in to show "this Mary's best magnificence of the great lover's mind." Both as a play and as literature the book is of little value, but perhaps our tireless British propagandists will yet succeed in persuading the gullible American public that here at last we have the portrait of the true Mary Stuart.

Miss Guiney's Praises.—Alice Brown contributes to the April *North American Review* a discerning appraisal of "An Amer-

ican Poet," her lamented friend, Louise Imogen Guiney. "Being Christian, she was, as in her life, all devotion, all pure obedience, rapt celebrant of the story of the Birth and the Cross, a vowed Eremite to the belief that counts all things loss, save One." After the "Golden City of belief," Miss Guiney served poetry, the "love of lovely words." The only verse she prized "was the verse with wings." Miss Brown cites the following lines as "so rare in form and color that the listening ear scarce cares for the meaning, so its music may go on and on":

When on the marge of evening the last blue light is broken,
And winds of dreamy odors are loosened from afar,
Or when my lattice opens, before the lark hath spoken,
On dim laburnum blossoms, and morning's dying star;
I think of thee (O mine the more if other eyes be sleeping!)
Whose great and noonday splendor the many share and see,
While sacred and forever, some perfect law is keeping
The late, the early twilight, alone and sweet for me.

A Protestant's St. Columba.—The page-margins of Lucy Menzies' "Saint Columba of Iona" (Dutton, \$2.50) will be frequently marked by the critical reader with all the signs that denote interrogation, doubt and positive denial: for the author, howsoever wide was her reading for this subject, lapses into innumerable errors both in historical fact and interpretations. Professor Eoin MacNeill's scholarly researches ought to have had a place among her "authorities" and her zeal for Columba's fame would have the guidance of truthful appreciations. Miss Menzies contributes some collateral matter which is interesting; but in the main, her view of the great Saint, of his mission and of his achievement, is defective. If some observer of a cathedral window were to report upon the grandeur of the window from the outside, he would not be expected to present a true report of the detail or the *ensemble* effect of the figures in the glass. Miss Menzies is looking at a historical character and a historical accomplishment from an outer sidewalk, not from an aisle within the temple.

Novels of Sorts.—It is hard to realize that the amiable people so realistically and attractively portrayed in Mr. Archibald Marshall's latest novel, "The Hall and the Grange" (Dodd, Mead, \$2.00), are the very ones who are now permitting and endorsing, at least by their silence, the British Government's merciless oppression of Ireland. For in the two Eldridge families he presents men and women whom the reader cannot help liking, tells how the quarrel started and grew between the two brothers, and describes the tranquil country life of England with such unusual artistry and is so skilful at keeping his characters human and consistent, that the reader's attention is closely held till the 414th, and last, page. If the young people of today could develop a zest for Mr. Marshall's novels, it would be a very good thing.—Enid Baghold has written an uninteresting love-story in the "Happy Foreigner" (Century, \$2.00). Its setting is France shortly after the armistice, and a French officer and an English girl, who is an ambulance driver, are the main characters in the story, but after 300 pages they are quite as tiresome as they were at the outset of the tale.—"She Who was Helena Cass" (Doran, \$2.00), by Lawrence Rising, is an impossible novel with inaccuracy and improbability conflicting in an attempted plot.—Meade Minnigerode's "The Big Year" (2.00) and Gabrielle E. Jackson's "Peggy Stewart, Navy Girl, at School" (\$1.85) are interesting books for boys and girls in their early teens. The first describes the joyful life led by the students of a well-known Eastern university and the second tells how a winsome Maryland maiden got on, both at the Columbia Heights school with her companions, and at home with her domineering aunt Katherine.—A really unusual book is "Half Loaves" (Doran, \$1.90), by Margaret Culkin Banning. It is a thorough analysis of the modern attitude toward marriage. The author's character-drawing power

is exceptional. The plot is carried practically by the growth into womanhood of two girls who are then placed in the struggle of modern American life. As they are prepared for their parts by two different educational systems, their philosophy of life is different, their mental and spiritual equipment utterly unlike. They work out their problems and the measure of their success is the tale that is told. There is interest in every chapter and what is more, there is a valuable message in the story.

For Teachers.—The very marrow of the sublimest dogmas is placed before us in "Latin Hymns" (Loyola University Press, Chicago), Edited with Introduction and Notes by Matthew Gerding, S.J. A few at least of the golden songs of Ambrose, Prudentius, Fortunatus, Columba, Bernard; the majestic dirge of Thomas de Celano, and the world's greatest elegy, Jacopone da Todi's "Stabat Mater" are presented in this unpretentious book, for the use of our Latin classes. In these selections, the editor appeals both to the scholar and the Christian. In most of these hymns, the Latin tongue speaks with a majesty it had never attained under the consuls and orators of old Rome, while in all, the noblest mysteries are presented in accents as sublime as they are simple, popular and tender. The little volume will carry a valuable message to its readers and students. No Catholic college in the United States should graduate its pupils until they have mastered every line of it. Should Father Gerding publish another edition, he must present his readers with more of these masterpieces. We dare ask above all, that to the peerless gems already gathered, he add many more from the well-nigh inspired lyrics of Adam of Saint Victor, Heaven's own lutenist.—"The Message of Francis Thompson" (Benziger, \$0.85) is the title of a good literary essay a Sister of Notre Dame wrote for the Glasgow Center of the English Association. The author well observes that Thompson "was first and foremost a religious poet," that "Catholicity was the very fountain of his inspiration," and in proof then aptly quotes from, and comments on, his poems.—"Snow-Bound and Other Poems" (Loyola University Press, Chicago), by John Greenleaf Whittier, edited for school use, with good notes, suggestive studies, glossary and a sketch of the author's life, is a recent number of the "Loyola English Classics."

Music.—"Missa Regina Pacis in Honor of St. Vincent Ferrer" (J. Fischer, New York, \$0.80) is by Pietro A. Yon, with the Gregorian melody, "Attende, Domine, et Miserere," ingeniously pervading the theme. It is a pleasing, devotional, practical composition, and is not difficult. The Mass was effectively rendered at the great diocesan celebration in Chicago last year, with full orchestra, and, at Christmas, was sung in at least six New York churches. From the liturgical viewpoint the fugues at the end of the *Gloria* and *Credo* occasion somewhat excessive repetition in the text, tending to sacrifice devotion to emotion; and the same inclination is slightly evident in the accompaniment to the *Benedictus*. There the movement is a little suggestive of the operatic. Great credit is due Mr. Yon for composing Masses on genuine religious themes taken from the Church's own treasury of Gregorian melodies.—"The Progressive Music Series Teacher's Manual, Vol. 2, for Fourth and Fifth Grades, Catholic Edition" (Silver, Burdett) is of the same high standard as the preceding volume. It contains a rare collection of juvenile songs of unquestionable musical and literary quality, described, interpreted, and graded to the different periods of child-life by such eminent musicians as Horatio Parker, Osborne McConathy, Edward Bailey Birge, and W. Otto Meissner. The Rt. Rev. Joseph Schrembs, D.D., and Father Gregory Huegle, O.S.B., are the Catholic editors of this series, which combines, with the teaching of elevating secular songs, systematic instruction in the official, liturgical

music of the Church: psalmody, the ordinary Mass chants and responses, the *Te Deum* and the principal Sequences. English translations accompany the Latin words. The children whose singing talent is cultivated on such a scientific diet of pure musical nourishment will be helped a long way towards entering manhood and womanhood with an intelligent appreciation of real art in both profane and religious song, and with a discriminating taste that will render them proof against the degrading "animal music" of the day. There is a valuable chapter of "General Suggestions" on musical pedagogy, voice-culture, sight-reading and interpretation.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- American Commission on Conditions in Ireland, 501 Fifth Ave., New York: Interim Report on Conditions in Ireland. \$0.35; \$3.50 per dozen; \$22.50 per hundred.
- American Irish Historical Society, New York: Journal—Historical Papers. By Michael J. O'Brien. Vol. XVIII. 1919.
- Benziger Brothers, New York: Social Organization in Parishes. By Rev. Edward F. Garesché, S. J. \$2.75; The Rule of St. Benedict, a Commentary. By the Right Rev. Dom Paul Delatte, Abbot of Solesmes and Superior General of the Benedictines of France. Translated by Dom Justin McCann, Monk of Ampleforth. \$7.00; A Mill Town Pastor. By Joseph Conroy, S. J. \$1.75.
- Bloud & Gay, Paris: Almanack Catholique Français pour 1921. 6 fr. 50.
- Donahoe Publishing Co., Middletown, Conn.: Songs for Christmas. By Daniel Joseph Donahoe.
- Boni & Liveright, New York: Mayfair to Moscow. Clare Sheridan's Diary. \$3.00.
- E. P. Dutton Co., New York: Across America with the King of the Belgians. By Pierre Goemaere. Authorized Translation from the French by Beatrice Sorchan. \$2.00.
- George H. Doran Co., New York: The Circus and Other Essays and Fugitive Pieces. By Joyce Kilmer. Edited with Introduction by Robert Cortes Holliday. \$2.50.
- Dorrance & Co., Philadelphia: Every Politician and His Wife. By Adele S. Burleson (Mrs. Albert Sidney Burleson). With an Introduction by Thomas R. Marshall, Vice-President of the United States. \$1.75.
- Extension Press, Chicago: Bird-a-Lea. By Clementia. Illustrated by James A. Waddell. \$1.50.
- St. Francis Mission, South Dakota: The Blackrobe in the Land of the Wigwam.
- Henry Holt & Co., New York: The Age of the Reformation. By Preserved Smith, Ph.D.; Ariosto, Shakespeare and Corneille. By Benedetto Croce. Translated by Douglas Ainslee; The Old Man's Youth. By William DeMorgan. \$2.00.
- J. de Gigord, Editeur. 15, Rue Cassette, Paris: L'Esprit de Renan. Pierre Guilloux.
- Harper & Brothers, New York: The Russian Workers' Republic. By Henry Noel Brailsford. \$2.50.
- B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis: A Handbook of Moral Theology. By Rev. Antony Koch, D.D. Adapted and Edited by Arthur Preuss. Vol. IV. Man's Duties to God. \$2.50.
- Houghton, Mifflin Co., Boston: A New England Group and Others. Shelburne Essays. Eleventh Series. By Paul Elmer More. \$2.00.
- P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York: The Official Catholic Directory. \$4.00; \$3.00 and \$2.50; A Practical Philosophy of Life, Facts, Principles, Actions. By Ernest R. Hull, S. J., Editor of the *Examiner*.
- Alfred A. Knopf, New York: Psychoanalysis, Sleep and Dreams. By Andre Tridon. \$2.00; Devil Stories, an Anthology. Selected and Edited with Introduction and Critical Comments. By Maximilian J. Rudwin. \$2.00.
- J. B. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia: The Charm of Fine Manners. Being a Series of Letters to a Daughter. By Helen Ekin Starrett. \$1.00.
- Longmans, Green & Co., New York: Life in Ancient Britain. A Survey of Social and Economic Development of the People of England from Earliest Times to the Roman Conquest. By Norman Ault. With Illustrations. \$2.00.
- The Macmillan Co., New York: At One with the Invisible. By Professor F. C. Porter and Others. \$3.00; Psychology and Natural Theology. By Owen A. Hill, S.J., Ph.D.; While Europe Waits for Peace. By Pierrepont B. Noyes. \$1.50; Essays in Critical Realism, a Co-operative Study of the Problem of Knowledge. By Durant Drake, and Others.
- Oxford University Press, London: Today and Yesterday, Sonnets and Other Verses. By William Dudley Foulke, LL.D.; The Tryst and Other Poems. By E. V. Rieu.
- St. Patrick's Church, South Bend, Indiana: Souvenir of Consecration.
- Frederick Pustet Co., Inc., New York: Efficiency in the Spiritual Life. By Sister M. Cecilia, a Religious of the Ursuline Convent of Our Lady of Lourdes. Paola, Kansas. \$1.50; Missale Romanum Ex Decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini Restitutum S. Pii V Pontificis Maximi Jussu Editum Aliorum Pontificum Cura Recognitum A Pio X Reformatum et Smi D. N. Benedicti XV Auctoritate Vulgatum Editio III Juxta Typicam Vaticanam. \$3.25; Repetitorium Theologiae Fundamentalibus. P. Virgilio Wass, O.M. Cap. \$1.25; De Poenis Ecclesiasticis. H. Noldin, S.J. Codici Juris Canonici Adaptavit A. Schönegger, S.J. \$0.50.
- G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York: As the Larks Rise. By Theodosia Garrison. \$1.75; Ships in Harbor. By David Morton. \$1.75; Rosa Mundi and Other Stories. By Ethel M. Dell. \$2.00; The House in Queen Anne Square. By W. D. Lyell. \$2.00.

EDUCATION

Arkansas Roads and Federalized Schools

IN these days space has been annihilated by the telegraph, the telephone and the wireless, and the cry from Arkansas to the Smith-Towner bill is not far at all. If you live in New York, you have probably noted with some interest that the *Times* which occasionally, and by accident as it were, happens to be right, has been reviewing the question of road-making in Arkansas. It would appear that Arkansas has been active in cooperating with the Federal "fifty-fifty" plan for making two good roads run where before there was not even one. That fact seems to be certain. After that, the film blurs on for a few hundred feet. But one gathers the impression that all is not well in the State of Arkansas. There are hints of political log-rolling, of taxation under plea of matching the Federal "appropriations" which taxed the farmers out of existence, whereupon their lands were bought in at a low rate, to the exceeding financial increment of the patriotic roadmakers.

"FIFTY-FIFTY" FEDERAL CONTROL

OF course, nothing of the kind would ever happen under the "fifty-fifty" plan of the Smith-Towner bill for the establishment of Federalized schools. Anyone whose acquaintance with schools and their ways is even of the briefest, knows that when there is question of public education, political schemes are absolutely barred. To know that, his acquaintance must needs be of the briefest. And likewise, of course, it is inconceivable that any Federal educational Czar would interfere in the slightest either with politico-educational brawls within the States, or with the educational programs which any State might adopt. That is probably true. He would not interfere; he would merely refuse to pay the offending State any part whatsoever of its Federal apportionment. Under the Smith-Towner bill, we have been told, his office is merely to secure the proper use of Federal apportionments by the States; to make sure that they will be used in accordance with the provisions of the act. But in questions of dispute as to what these provisions are the Federal Secretary is the supreme judge, and his course would be precisely the course taken by the Secretary of Agriculture in the Arkansas road case.

Secretary Wallace said that he would call for a complete report of the Arkansas situation, and from the tenor of his remarks it was plain that unless these Arkansas special district laws are changed to conform in every detail with the plans of the Federal Government, which means reducing the tax-burden and the placing of highway control in efficient hands, that the more than \$4,000,000 of the Federal funds which have been allotted to Arkansas will remain in the Government vaults here at Washington. (New York *Times*, April 2).

You see how charmingly simple it is. In the "fifty-fifty" scheme, a Federal official never interferes in the least with State plans. He merely inspects the plans and if they do not measure up to his standard, he closes the money-bag. After that, "the Federal funds which have been allotted will remain in the Government vaults in Washington." Could anything be fairer? For it is elemental that what the Federal Government subsidizes the Federal Government controls. The schools will form no exception.

FEDERAL CONTROL ABSOLUTE

THIS is the attitude taken by the editor of the Baltimore *Manufacturers Record*, a trade paper which does not confine its attention to parochial interests. In his *Daily Bulletin*, he writes on March 2:

It is not reasonable to suppose that the United States would expend millions without control of the spending units.

The contention was made and proved to the satisfaction of the colonists that when the colonial judges were paid their salaries from London, it was to London they

gave their first consideration. Communities drawing school funds from Washington will do as Washington says, sooner or later. . . . The vagaries of a particular professor would be taught as gospel truth from one end of the country to the other. Education would be standardized. We know of nothing that could be more fatal to independent thought and development than that.

We do not want Democratic schools or Republican schools or Socialistic schools. We do not want the type of education to be determined by a general election. We do not want a Federalized educational system which would form the nucleus for a new sort of political machine. We do not want that little red schoolhouse on the top of the hill to have a teacher who looks to Washington for instruction. We do not want cold-blooded machine-like education. No community gets anything for nothing from Washington. No dollars flow from the Federal till unless they have first flowed in there. Any State can better afford to pay its taxes directly for the support of its educational system than to pipe the taxes first to Washington and then have them, in part, piped back again.

We conceive it our duty to warn the States generally and the Southern States in particular, to look this gift-horse in the mouth. The States have been robbed already of almost every power specifically reserved to them by the Constitution. If they are going to surrender also control of their own educational processes, they may just as well give up the local governments and consent to be ruled entirely by emissaries appointed in Washington.

We can solve the illiteracy problem without giving up our form of government. The price of liberty is eternal vigilance.

That sums up the case very well, and I am glad it has been done by a Southern journal. The South needs the lesson. The *Confederate Veteran* for March, notes with triumph that "some of the statesmen from the North and Northwest, apparently have been converted to the views held by statesmen of the South in antebellum days." That is true. But the pity is that the South, once bled white in defense of local self-government, for the last thirty years has taken the lead in the movement to destroy local self-government. The Eighteenth Amendment is but one case in point, and the chief defense of the Smith-Towner bill has come from a Southern Senator, while its chief opponents are found in the North.

WISDOM FROM FLORIDA

I YIELD to the temptation to quote another Southern view of the Smith-Towner bill. I find it in the same *Manufacturers Record* for, auspicious date, March 17, and it is attributed to the *Morning Tribune*, of Tampa, Florida.

The Smith-Towner education bill is dangerous, unjust, and unwise, because:

It attempts to bribe the States into surrendering their constitutional rights to control the education of their citizens; and because it pretends to give the States a right to dictate courses of study, and then declares that the "dictator of education" has the right and power to withhold the appropriation of any State, "whenever he shall determine that such appropriations are not being spent in accordance with the provisions of this act"; and because it puts one political appointee as "dictator of education" in absolute command of the spending of \$100,000,000 of the people's school money, with power to say what States shall receive and what States shall be refused a share of the appropriations; and because, in order to raise the \$100,000,000 proposed to be put in the hands of this "dictator," some of the States will have to be taxed three times as much as they can possibly get back from the fund; and because it does not provide for an educational system, but for a national political organization to be used for the purposes that the party in power may demand; and because it provides a penalty and fine on the States which have erected great school systems, for the benefit of States which have been too mean to pay their teachers living-wages; and because it proposes to standardize the mind of American coming generations, the "dictator" himself having power to cut and present the pattern which shall be used for the standardization.

I have not read so long a sentence since I came North, or one so full of hard common-sense. The editor from Florida is

under no delusions of Smith-Towner grandeur, and his assertion that the bill "provides a penalty and fine on the States which have erected great school systems for the benefit of States which have been too mean to pay their teachers living-wages" is a refreshingly new way of stating an old truth.

DR. CLAXTON'S FEDERALIZED TEXTBOOKS

LET me now turn my attention to another eminent Southerner, Dr. Philander P. Claxton, Federal Commissioner of Education. I hear Dr. Claxton has recently called another conference, this time on community service, in Washington. I can express no censure on Dr. Claxton's mode of life so far as it reflects his personal tastes; but I do wish that he would spend more time in his Bureau and less time in conferences throughout the country. I am sure that the *elan vital* of his presence would do much to shock the Bureau of Education into something like a reasonable degree of efficiency.

Dr. Claxton comes into this picture by reason of his testimony given when the House Committee on Education held a hearing on the bill for the education of illiterates (H. R. 15,402) on February 15, 1919. Dr. Claxton then proposed his plan of textbooks to be published by the Federal Government, modestly referring to it as something that "has never been done in this country." As sections of the Smith-Towner bill incorporate the main purpose of this Americanization bill, Dr. Claxton's testimony is interesting as indicating the easy control of textbooks in the local schools, if Americans ever allow the enactment of the Smith-Towner monstrosity. Governmental textbooks on civics and "the spirit of the American Government" would contain precisely those principles in favor with the dominant political party, and none other.

I think it is desirable to state that it would be necessary to do what has never been done in this country—to prepare charts and books. If you are going to teach millions of illiterates you want a book that will be simple in language as a child's primer, but in its content will be interesting; and these little books or booklets will pertain to agriculture, to home-making, to the trades and industries in which these people are engaged—

And will furnish a splendid vehicle for governmental propaganda to be paid for by an over-taxed people.

These will have to be prepared, and prepared with great care, by the Bureau of Education and the first editions of them at least probably printed by the public printer so that they may be had at a reasonable price by the people who use them. . . . For that purpose a very large part of the appropriation which we ask for the Bureau of Education would have to be used and without this ability to do it we would be floundering around for some time to come.

"Floundering" is a rare good word, and not restricted to the Bureau's inability to print textbooks.

The same thing will apply to the language books to be made, and the charts to be made to teach the English language to the ones who cannot read it, speak it or write it.

Coming back—just one minute and I will finish—it will be necessary for either native-born or foreign-born to prepare, or direct the preparation of, certain other books or charts or booklets regarding the history of the United States in its government, in its manners and customs. That would be for the foreign-born people; and in order that it may be done promptly and effectively

and with a due regard to the purposes of propaganda,

and tested and remade if they do not succeed at first, it is necessary that the Federal Government, through its Bureau of Education, shall be enabled to do that work. (Hearings on H. R. 15,402, p. 69).

That the Smith-Towner legislation will create Federal control of the local schools, no serious student of the bill can doubt. Dr. Claxton shows clearly how that control can be extended to the very textbooks used by the children. Could Bismarck go further?

JOHN WILBYE.

SOCIOLOGY

On to Centralization

IT has been observed by Mr. Robert Lansing that his chief at Paris was wont to display, when crossed, a certain impatience of legal forms and constitutional inhibitions. I have long thought that the impatience attributed to Mr. Wilson is characteristic of many social campaigns made in our day. Men see the evils so clearly that they are unwilling to wait upon legal methods of removing them. "Do you think that quite constitutional?" I recently ventured, to a gentleman whose fame as a reformer is by no means local. "O, the Constitution," he rapped out impatiently. "Things are so bad that we've got to make this move at once." His attitude was precisely that of the political boss who did not understand why the Constitution should be permitted to interfere with his plans. And it seems to me that his spirit is that of much of the social legislation which today we are asked to welcome. As long as it proposes to do a good thing, whether or not it is constitutional does not matter. Good or bad, that spirit is absolutely opposed to the form of government under which we live.

THE BENEVOLENT TYRANT

THE Constitution of the United States did not create a paternalistic government. That instrument was drawn up by a hardy, independent, God-fearing, self-sufficient people who surely never dreamed that within little more than a century the Federal Government would be issuing bulletins on the construction of corn-cribs and on the care of teething children. These men thought they could regulate their own personal affairs, and they legislated for a people like themselves. The governments under which they had lived, they regarded as their servants, the agents to effect for the common good what no individual could establish. They believed, as it seems to me, that the government which governed least was the best government for them. In forming the first State Constitutions they were careful to describe the powers which they conferred. The Federal Constitution is confessedly a grant of limited and enumerated powers, devised by men who knew from harrowing experience the evil consequences of the loose bonds of the Confederacy. The powers conferred are few in comparison with the powers reserved. The first Americans did not think the creation of strong centralized governments necessary. There is, it is true, a philosophy which finds in the benevolent tyrant the most desirable of governments. The tyrant has unlimited power. He is not bound by legislatures or judges, or even by the people. If wrongs exist, he can redress them at once. These are advantages. But a benevolent tyranny was not the government which our fathers ordained. When evils exist they must be cured, as far as intervention of the civil power is concerned, in a constitutional manner, and in the extirpation of social evils, the Government was to be the last, not the first, resort.

On this point, I venture to think, modern social reformers part company with the founders of the Republic. Their ideal, it seems to me, is an omnipotent legislature empowered to enact laws affecting the individual in his most personal concerns. The Volstead law, to take a ready instance, actually defines as intoxicating liquors which in fact are not intoxicating. The plea, I suppose, is that the misuse of alcohol is a social menace which cannot be removed except by first depriving all citizens of a right which most of them did not abuse, and next, by incorporating into a Federal statute a statement which scientifically, is as true as saying that the earth is flat.

STATE AND THE CHILD

CONSIDER, again, the present relation of the civil power to the father's right over the education of his child. In the colonial period, among a small and homogeneous population, an

effort was made to provide means of schooling at the common expense. If the parent did not take advantage of this opportunity he was punished, not so much because he had sinned against the community as because he had sinned against the child. But public education did not loom large in the consciousness of early American legislators. The public school, as it is understood today, did not exist. Not a man who signed the Declaration of Independence or sat at Philadelphia to deliberate in 1787, but would have rejected the principle on which it is founded. The third article of the Northwest Ordinance, usually misquoted by the omission of the first two words, declares that "Religion, morality and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." But there is no mention of schools either in the Articles of Confederation or in the Federal Constitution. Nothing could have been more alien to the thoughts of these early Americans than that the time would come when, regardless of the father's preference, a determined effort would be made to sweep every child into schools completely controlled by the civil power, and to forbid his attendance at any private institution.

STATE AND TEACHING

YET today it is the common persuasion that education is primarily and fundamentally the right of the civil power, that all who teach, teach by tacit or explicit grant of that power, and that it is the State, not the father, to whom pertains the right to dictate the education of the child. Education is no longer free. A father is not free to send his child to school or teach him at home, as he elects. He is not free to choose the child's manner of training, but must submit to the training dictated by the civil power. Not only this, but there is the dogged campaign, as in Iowa and Michigan, against the right of the father to entrust his child to any but the Caesarized school. It is not claimed that the private school gives a training inferior to the training in the public schools. It is not claimed that in character and professional ability the teachers cannot at least match the teachers in the public schools. No doubt the hateful fire of religious bigotry is in the attack. But making due allowance for this unreasoning spirit, the conviction honestly held today by thousands that all children must be educated by the State, is perhaps the most dangerous form of paternalism which has yet attacked the constitutional form of Americanism. Curiously, too, this philosophy usually professes to base itself upon "democracy" and genuine "Americanism." Nothing can be more un-American and autocratic. It is an historical fact that the system of compulsory education in State schools has never existed amongst us. It has, existed, however, in a high degree of perfection, in bureaucratic France and Prussia, where it was quite in keeping with the paternalistic, undemocratic nature of these governments. But it cannot be reconciled with American ideals, as expressed in the Federal and State Constitutions. Next to religion, the greatest social force at work in the body politic, is public education. That this force be put under the complete control of the civil power is incompatible with the ideals of a democracy. We must not allow the establishment of such control.

ELIMINATING THE INDIVIDUAL

EDUCATION is the most notable, but not the only instance in which it is sought to bring within State control activities which belong primarily to the individual or to the community. Other cases in point are the Sheppard-Towner maternity bill and the hundreds of similar measures annually proposed at Washington and in our State capitals. In a different sphere, are the determined effort to destroy the right of the States to fix rates for railroads engaged in intra-State traffic, the Volstead act, a blow to the police powers of the States which may be fatal, and the various campaigns to destroy freedom of

speech. In nearly all these measures, the purpose aimed at is good, but the machinery by which it is to be reached certainly cannot be reconciled with the American concept of government. Without exception they centralize power in a manner for which no justification can be found in our constitutional history. They are impatient of constitutional inhibitions. "The Constitution! Things are so bad we've got to make this move at once." And the move destroys, or tends to destroy, individual initiative, independence, self-reliance. If the tendency to disregard constitutional principles in order to effect an immediate reform becomes the accepted rule of procedure, the great American experiment in democracy has failed, not because it has been tried and found wanting, but because the only writ under which it can operate properly and effectively, has been destroyed.

P. L. B.

NOTE AND COMMENT

Average Factory Wages in New York State

THE average weekly earnings of employees in all the various manufacturing industries of New York State, as indicated in the recently published January reports, was \$27.61. This was the first evidence of a general downward revision of wage-rates, since the decline in the months immediately preceding had been due mainly to part-time work. The average decrease in wages, as indicated in these reports to the Bureau of Statistics of the New York State Industrial Commission, was seventy-four cents a week as compared with the December figures. Since a number of firms have announced reductions in wage-rates to take place in succeeding months, a gradual recession of the wage-level is predicted. Where reductions have been made they vary from five to thirty-three and one-third per cent.

Creighton University Professor Honored

THE Distinguished Service Medal was recently awarded to Dr. Karl Connell, professor of surgery at Creighton University. The signal service rendered by him consisted in the invention of gas masks. "The first all-American mask, that was then and is today a complete protection against all known gasses," according to the words of Lt. Col. Amos A. Fries, Chief of Chemical Warfare Service, was produced by him in March, 1918. After that, we are told by this competent authority, Major Connell threw his whole soul into the problem of developing what is now the 1919 American mask, "the finest mask in the world." The delayed recognition has recently been bestowed by the War Department in accordance with the original decision of General Pershing. Dr. Connell is not merely a professor at Creighton University, but also began his medical studies there. Before leaving for France in November, 1917, he had won fame as an inventor of masks for the administration of anesthetics.

Fund for the First Serbian Catholic Church

JUST before Easter the first annual meeting of the Society for the Erection of a Catholic Church in Belgrade was held in that city. A telegram of loyalty was sent to the Pope, who expressed his gratification at this first tribute from Serbia to the Successor of St. Peter and gave his blessing to the president of the organization, Mr. Charles Matausek, and to all the promoters of this work. Notwithstanding the poverty of the people substantial sums have already been collected towards the erection of Serbia's first Catholic church. To aid in this undertaking Miss Annie Christitch of Serbia has come to America, with the approbation of the Holy Father, and has

been speaking at large Catholic Slav centers to gain their co-operation. With the encouragement of the American Hierarchy she is now to lecture before other Catholic audiences also, and in Catholic schools, to obtain prayers no less than financial contributions towards the spiritual reconstruction of the newly liberated lands. The speedy erection of a Catholic church in Serbia will be the first step towards a clearer understanding of Catholic ideals and principles by the Serbian Orthodox Christians. Protestants in America are showing considerable sympathy for the Yugoslavs and it is important that Catholics should interest themselves equally in this cause. Donations for the first Serbian Catholic church will be duly forwarded by the Editor of AMERICA.

Italy's Plans for Dante Day

ELABORATE preparations are everywhere being made for a worthy celebration of the "Dante Year." As John H. Finley, chairman of the Dante National Committee for our own country, says: it is indeed remarkable that "a medievalist should call forth the homage of the twentieth century to the extent of being honored in all civilized lands and by cultured people who, for the most part, do not know the language spoken by him, or do not profess the religion of him who wrote the most religious book of all Christianity" [the Bible and the "Imitation" excepted]. The eyes of the world naturally turn to Italy at the present moment. Of the preparations under way there the Boston *Evening Transcript* writes:

The Italian Government has appropriated 2,000,000 lire for the publication of a new edition of Dante's works and for the restoration of the Baptistery of Florence, *il mio bel Giotto*.

Pope Benedict XV. has written the Archbishop of Ravenna encouraging him to proceed with the restoration of Dante's place of worship. The words of His Holiness are significant: "Dante is ours. He has mounted to the very heights of the Catholic Faith and has sung in a poem almost Divine the ministry of our august religion."

A broad program of architectural restoration is being carried out. This naturally centers about Ravenna. In addition to the work upon the Braccioforte recess and the rearrangement of the Medieval Museum, the Da Polente Chapel in San Francisco, the Classense Library, and the adjoining hall containing the Dante relics will all be restored and redecorated.

Buildings in Florence and in other parts of Italy connected with the life of Dante, or described in his works, will also be restored. The excavations and researches which this will entail are expected to unearth many relics of historical and literary importance. The Conti Guidi castle at Poppi, the Arco dei Cavi at Verona, the palace of Boniface VIII, at Anagni, and the Palagio di Parte Guelfa in Florence are the principal edifices to be recreated. The last-named structure dates back to 1267, and was the headquarters of the mighty Guelf faction. The walls are reputed to have been painted by Giotto.

A Dante film, moreover, will be released throughout the entire world for Dante Day, September 4, by Fausto Salvatori. As a setting for the action a perfect reproduction of the Palace of the Scaligeri has been built. Dante lectures and Dante literature will be the order of the day, not merely in Italy, where "the man in the street is talking Dante, reading Dante, reciting Dante from memory," but throughout the entire civilized world.

Wet Exodus of Dry Administration

A VERY wet exodus was made by the late dry Administration at Washington, according to the account in the *American Israelite*. Government guarantees of safety, we are told, were stamped upon the big cellar stocks of the ex-president, Cabinet officers and Representatives in Congress, as the legal permits

for removal were given by Prohibition Commissioner Kramer, who is quoted as dryly remarking that: "Higher officials have fine stock and in abundance."

Among those to whom permits were given were President Wilson, Secretaries Baker, Colby, Burleson and Payne, and scores of defeated Representatives and some Senators, who are removing their wet goods to their homes.

Commissioner Kramer's office during the last two days was overrun with officials of every class who were fated to join the exodus from Washington after March 4. One Representative listed several barrels, while the liquor shown to have been possessed by the average applicant rarely went below dozen-case lots.

Prohibition officials treated these incidents with the greatest secrecy. Considerable interest attached to the details concerning the stock of White House liquors. These were removed from the Executive Mansion to the new residence of Mr. Wilson on S Street. In the shipment was a whole barrel of fine Scotch whisky, besides a variety of rare wines and liquors.

We certainly do not begrudge these liquid joys to the dry Administration that made America safe for Prohibition! They have well earned their reward. But it is difficult for "the other fellow," who digs in the trench or sweats at the furnace, to see why he alone must be virtuous.

The Proposed "State of Manhattan"

NEW YORK CITY is seeking relief from Albany rule. To end what they regard as a continued discrimination against them a great number of New York citizens favor the separation of Greater New York, Westchester County and Long Island into a new "State of Manhattan." The population of this territory at present exceeds that of sixteen other States combined and of all the territories of the United States in addition, with the exception of the District of Columbia and Porto Rico, by more than 150,000. New York City alone has 5,621,151 residents, and more daily visitors than Delaware has population. The total population of the new State of Manhattan would be 7,700,000. Its area would be 2,272 square miles, twice the size of Rhode Island, and considerably larger than the State of Delaware. These are some of the figures gathered from the *New York American*, which earnestly advocates the proposed plan. In regard to New York City itself it offers the following additional statistics:

New York has nearly as many school children as Connecticut has population. The parks of the city cover an area of 4,500 acres, enough on which to build a sizable town. The assessed valuation of these parks alone is \$489,989,028.

More than twenty-one per cent of the nation's bank resources are in New York. The resources of the country's banks are in excess of \$30,000,000,000, while the resources of New York banks are over \$6,000,000,000. New York banks have a total capital in excess of \$250,000,000 and deposits over \$6,000,000,000.

New York has 3,616 miles of streets, enough to reach from New York to and beyond San Francisco. If you walked ten miles a day it would take a year to cover all the streets of the city. New York has a subway system about 230 miles long, almost equal to the distance between New York and Boston. There isn't a single subway elsewhere in New York State. New York has 1,500 hotels, 1,600 churches (it is the largest church center in the world). It has two of the largest hotels in the world, one with 2,000 and the other 2,200 rooms, and they are always crowded to the doors.

New York has steamships lines to 90 per cent of the ports of the world.

This city produces one-tenth of all the manufactured goods of the United States. It has 38,000 factories, representing an investment of \$2,000,000,000. It produces one-half of all the clothing worn by men and women in this country.

These are given as just a few modest reasons why the editor of the *American* believes that the State of Manhattan would probably be the greatest in the Union.

